SEXUAL LIFE IN ANCIENT INDIA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/sexuallifeinanci0000joha

The Broadway
Oriental Library
Edited by CLEMENT EGERTON

SEXUAL LIFE IN ANCIENT INDIA

The Broadway
Oriental Library

Edited by CLEMENT EGERTON

Women under Primitive Buddhism
by I. B. HORNER

Sexual Life in Ancient India
by J. J. MEYER

The Political Philosophy of Confucius
by LEONARD S. HSU

Feasts and Songs of Ancient China
by PROFESSOR M. GRANET

Other Volumes in Preparation

SEXUAL LIFE IN ANCIENT INDIA

A STUDY IN THE COMPARATIVE HISTORY OF INDIAN CULTURE

by

JOHANN JAKOB MEYER

VOLUME ONE

NEW YORK
E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY
1930

Authorized Translation from the German, containing the emendations and additions of the Author. The extra references of one of the Translators are indicated by square brackets.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, LTD., HERTFORD.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

THE BROADWAY ORIENTAL LIBRARY is intended, primarily, to appeal to that section of the educated public which, while not directly interested in the technical aspects of Oriental studies, is distinctly interested in their practical results. Those who are themselves specialists sometimes, perhaps, under-estimate the value of an attempt to put into untechnical language the conclusions at which experts like themselves have arrived. They fear that "popularization" must entail, if not the sacrifice of scientific accuracy, at least a relative disregard of scientific method in presentation. They are apt to assume that, unless the reader is himself a student of their particular subject, he is likely to be misled by a non-technical work. The Orientalist, especially, shows a reluctance to descend from the Olympian heights of the periodical literature of his learned society in order to make his work accessible and intelligible to the outsider, whose main desire is not to study the subject for its own sake, but for some other reason.

Yet is is becoming increasingly difficult to confine fields of study to separate compartments, and, as the work which is being done by specialists is producing an enormous mass of new facts and new knowledge, it is becoming more and more essential for the non-expert to secure access to that part of the expert's conclusions which is germane to his own particular interest.

There are, in fact, two distinct types of non-specialist reader. In the first place, there is the inveterate accumulator of information, who likes to know a little about everything, from the fabrication of green cheese to the structure of the atom ; who hardly troubles to assimilate the information he acquires, and prefers, if possible, not to pay more than sixpence for each dose of it. For some reason, the expert has recently become far more generous to this type of reader than he would have dreamed of being twenty years ago.

The other type is that of the educated man who realizes that his interest in particular problems of humanity demands that he should widen the sphere of his investigations and find out how those problems have arisen and been dealt with in other civilizations, at different stages in those civilizations and from varying angles and points of view.

He may be interested, for example, in the pressing and clamorous problem of the relations of the sexes. He appreciates the necessity for a historical background to his study, so far as his own civilization is concerned, and this he can secure without any very great difficulty. But when a book appears or something happens which draws his attention to the same fundamental problem in another civilization, he is at a loss, because, so far as he is concerned, the necessary background is lacking. It is utterly irrational for a western reader to form a judgment or even an opinion upon the questions so luridly propounded in Miss Mayo's *Mother India*, without such a background. It is also politically dangerous. Unfortunately, it has been very difficult to secure any such scientific and impartial attitude.

The BROADWAY ORIENTAL LIBRARY is intended, in a measure, to meet the needs of the latter type of reader. It is not popular in the usual sense of the word. The two volumes of Professor Meyer's work are not easy reading. But they make available in intelligible form, the results of years of highly specialized labour. They illustrate conceptions of Indian thought which have determined the whole attitude of Indian civilization in regard to the relations of the sexes, for two thousand years, and show how, for good or for evil, that attitude is fundamental.

One of the most vital problems of the present day is that of the relations of the great civilizations one with another. Its solution depends upon a sound comprehension of the principles underlying those civilizations and their history. It is hoped that the BROADWAY ORIENTAL LIBRARY may be useful in this connection.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

IN the preface to the German edition of this book, Professor Meyer tells us that it is an attempt to give a true and vivid account of the life of woman in ancient India, based upon the immense masses of material imbedded in the two great Epics, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*. His method has been to make liberal use of the very words of the Epics.

The *Mahābhārata* seems to occupy an unique place in the literature of the world. Parts of it, like the *Bhagavad-gītā*, and the story of Nala and Damayantī, have become familiar to educated readers in almoſt every country of the weſt, but these are only fragments of an enormous work, consiſting of about a hundred thousand couplets, of which Professor Macdonell says[1] :—

> " Its epic kernel, amounting to about one-fifth of the whole work, became so much overgrown with didactic matter that it could hardly be regarded as an epic at all, and has rather taken the place of a moral encyclopaedia in Indian literature."

It provides us with moſt valuable sources of information about the relations of the sexes, and the concepts underlying those relations, in India fifteen hundred and more years ago.

Professor Meyer has used the Bombay edition of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and the second impression of the Bombay *Mahābhārata*. All his references which do not specify a particular title are to this version of the *Mahābhārata*. To some extent, he has consulted what he calls the Kumbakonam version " mainly based on the South Indian texts ". This he refers to as K.

For the present translation, Professor Meyer has completely revised the German work, made various alterations in the text, and considerably enlarged the number of references.

ABBREVIATIONS

SBE.	Sacred Books of the Eaſt (edited by F. Max Müller).
JAOS.	Journal of the American Oriental Society.
JRAS.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
ZDMG.	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
WZKM.	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.

[1] *India's Past* (p. 88). Oxford, 1927.

CONTENTS

PAGE

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION vii

I.—THE MAID

a. The daughter is unwelcome 6
b. The daughter is beloved and happy 8
c. The spoiled daughter 11
d. The good daughter 21
e. The fallen maiden and her sorrow 31
f. Maidenhood restored or unscathed in sexual intercourse 33, 35, 41–43
g. High esteem set on maidenly purity 43
h. The fair one with determination in things of love . . . 45

II.—MARRIAGE: TO WHOM AND HOW IS THE MAIDEN TO BE MARRIED?

a. The father's (the kinsfolk's) right to marry away the daughter 54
b. The father's duty to marry his daughter away 54
c. The different kinds of marriage 55
d. To whom shall the daughter be given? . . . 56, 57, 60, 62
e. What makes the marriage and the promise of marriage valid in law? 58
f. Age, character, and caste of the maiden whom the man must or may wed 57, 58, 63, 65
g. Division of inheritance among the children of wives from different castes (as also the wife's share), and position of the wives from different castes 65
h. Marriage by capture 67
i. The "self-choice" of the maiden (Svayaṃvara) . . . 78
k. The Gandharva marriage 89
l. Marriage by purchase 100
m. Marriages between Brahmans and nobles 104
n. The marriage of younger brothers or sisters before the elder forbidden 105

PAGE

o. Polyandry 108
p. Hetærism 115
q. Speculations on the true nature of marriage . . . 130

III.—THE WEDDING

a. The festival and usages 139
b. Wedding-gifts to the bridegroom ; dowry to the bride . . 141

IV.—LIFE IN MARRIAGE

a. Wedlock a necessity for both sexes 146
b. High dignity of the estate of father of the household . . 151
c. Wedlock especially needful to woman 155
d. Overcoming unfruitfulness 156
e. Deputed fathership (especially through Brahmans) . . 160
f. The Levirate 165
g. The different kinds of sons 174
h. Family life and family happiness 183
i. Love of parents for the children 184
k. Sorrow of the kinsfolk for the dead child 186
l. The misfortune of having but one child 191
m. Love of children for the parents 194

V.—WOMAN AS MOTHER

a. The high dignity and position of the mother . . . 199
b. Behaviour when duty towards the mother conflicts with that towards the father 201
c. Reverence of children towards the mother 208
d. Tender love of the mother towards the children . . . 210

VI.—WOMAN IN HER SEXUAL RELATIONS

a. The moral earnestness of the Epic (love and wedlock inseparably bound together for the woman) . . . 214
b. The ṛitu (the time meet for fertilization) and its high importance. The right and duty of coition is founded on it 215
c. The man then must 217
d. The woman then will 220

PAGE

e. The man's seed sent off by bird-post to her that is ready for fertilization 223
f. Commerce with her that is still unclean strictly forbidden . 225

VII.—THE PLEASURES OF SEX (SURATA)

a. The woman's joy and vigour in the pleasures of love . . 229
b. Punishment for disturbing the surata (death during the sexual embrace) 233
c. The joys of love as a healing herb 238
d. Means for heightening the powers and heroes in strength of love 239
e. Uncleanness of the surata 240
f. Regulation of the pleasures of sex (not in public, not outside the vulva, not by day or at certain other times, not with another woman than the wife) 241
g. Punishments awaiting the lewd man in this life and in the other 246
h. The dreadfulness of intercourse with the teacher's wife or with a woman of higher caste 251
i. Other details: not to look on a naked stranger woman, atonement for nightly pollution, a thoughtful hero of chastity, etc. 256

VIII.—THE SEXUAL CONTINENCE OF MAN

a. Value of chasity in general 258
b. The ascetic's complete sexual denial, its dignity, and power, its difficulty, and the means of keeping it 258
c. The curber of his senses who was seduced by the woman . 260
d. The ascetic who was set in an orgasm through the sight only of a lovely woman 261

IX.—THE PLEASURES OF VENAL LOVE: THE PUBLIC WOMAN

a. Prostitution in full flower 264
b. The harlot a necessity of life; an important part of social life; she accompanies in war, the hunt, and other diversions 266
c. The woman of pleasure as an ornament to the festival, escort of honour for and attendant on the important guest . . 268
d. Condemnation of the venal woman 273

SEXUAL LIFE IN ANCIENT INDIA

I

The Maid

THE Mahābhārata in its present form is a composition from widely separated periods in the history of Old Indian literature, and its elements are derived from various parts of the Old Indian land. It was not written by one man, but it is the work contributed by many hands. It is a growth : one piece from here, another from there ; one from this time, another from that. Like an Indian jungle it spreads out before us in an endless wilderness of trees entwined and tangled with rank creepers, coloured and scented with manifold flowers and blossoms, and the home of every kind of living creature. Bewitching bird-song, the terrifying cries of wild beasts fall on our ears ; the poisonous snake winds its coils beside the mild dove ; the robber dwells therein, free, indeed, from the law, but often the slave of superstitions beyond belief ; and so the self-denying thinker with his eyes set above the earth, and his thoughts reaching into the depths of the world and of his soul. There lie the roots of a glowing, unbounded wealth of life, of a will strong beyond any other power ; and by their side are found the depths of dreaming, the heavy dead sleep of many thousand years, so that we should ourselves sink into it, too, were it not for the swarms of stinging flies. And so we could long go on, setting wonder against wonder, but hardly ever reaching an end to it all ! It is a " great sea ", to sail over which " threefold bronze " is needed, not, indeed, about the breast, but anyhow, about another, not so heroic part of the body.

The Rāmāyaṇa, on the other hand, has a closer unity, it being, indeed, very generally attributed by the critics to one poet. But in this case, too, whether or no we put our faith in tradition, it is clear that from the very beginning various parts were brought together and made use of, and that later all kinds of interpolations and changes were made.

Thus in very many points we can look for no inner consistency in either of the two great national Epics of India. In every human being, indeed, we can find a host of contradictions side by side ; how much the more will they be found where so many minds have helped in the building up of one work. Both Epics bear the clearest Indian stamp ; through both, too, runs one view only of the world : the Quietist view. But while this seems fairly natural to the Rāmāyaṇa, to the real stem of the Mahābhārata it is utterly strange, and has been only gradually grafted on to the mighty growth of the wild plant. The Rāmāyaṇa, indeed, is seen from the very beginning to be essentially soft, dreamy, fantastic, and deeply religious—to be a work of the Brahmans. On the other hand, the poetry of the Mahābhārata is often quickened in its older parts by a mighty flame of fire, a manly, undaunted, passionate soul : it was a warrior that sung this heroic song, whoever it may be to whom the "original Mahābhārata" may be referred. Later hands then fixed all kinds of labels on the pieces that had been preserved in greater perfection, utterly re-modelled much, inserted long pieces, and sought, well or ill, to give the whole the tendentious coating of Brahmanism. Out of a rugged epic, in which the proud warrior, boasting his strength and power, was the main, perhaps the only concern, it became the aim to glorify the priest as never before or since in the world's literature, and at an early stage the paragon Arjuna and the wretched canting Yudhishṭhira were set in the place of Karṇa, the sun's son, and of the mighty Duryodhana, without the result, however, of robbing the old and true heroes of all their splendour, not to speak of raising the utterly worthless favourites of the priests to the same heights.[1] Everywhere the structure of

[1] The fact of this utter reversal of the earlier state of things is beyond any doubt. The explanation of this extraordinary phenomenon will perhaps always be a matter for conjecture. Despite a huge difference,

the Epic itself shows gaping joins and fissures. To this is added the heavy additional weight of the most diverse episodes and interpolations. In the details, too, of the observations and wearisome details as to God and the World, as to Man and his nature and actions, we very often find utter contradictions; and this is so whether the ruthless warrior or the softer thinker, the ardent ascetic or the sly priest is speaking, whether individual peculiarities, or the shades derived from time and place, or some other influence are to be seen.

When, therefore, there are already so many contradictions found side by side, it is seen at once that, on the subject of that great bundle of contradictions, Woman and all belonging to her, or to speak more exactly, on the subject of the reflection of this object in the brain and heart of Man, the two great Epics, especially the Mahābhārata, contain very contradictory utterances, and that often one saying will flatly contradict another. This lies first of all in the nature of the Indian. In other lands, too, the attitude of the feelings and thoughts of man towards woman very often undergoes changes according to the state of mind and experience of life, and above all according to personal experience of the fairer half of mankind, not to speak of the more or less dominating deeper character of the individual, or other influences. And thus even in the cooler West the proverbs, the songs, the tales, and so forth about women make up the most twisted bundle in the world. In the soul of the Indian there dwells that twin pair, burning sensuality and stark renunciation of the world and the flesh. What a delight and torment then must woman be to him! And

Duryodhana reminds me strongly of Saul in the Old Testament, Yudhishṭhira of David. The Pāṇḍava are favourites of the priestly party, and doubtless did not win this place for nothing. These evidently non-Aryan intruders may have hidden the multitude of their sins, after the way only too well-known, with the cloak of priestly fawning, as crafty "converts" to Brahmanism. The Kaurava, on the contrary, as the doughty champions of the warrior nobility, probably aroused the undying hatred of the Brahmans. Since writing this I have come upon the excellent remarks of W. Crooke, *The North-Western Provinces of India* (1897), p. 65, where he describes the spirit of the two Epics as I have done.

since he is wont to express his impressions and views with great violence, has no fear of any deduction and drives everything to its utmost end, we might put together a more than gigantic folio volume on woman from Indian literature, whose various parts would only have this in common : their contradiction of one another.

But I think that there is one thing that can be picked out, from the nature of the Indian we have just been describing, as a specific attribute : among other peoples, or among the Western civilized nations, we find a more delicate colouring, more individuality, a greater variety and richness in the variations on the inexhaustible theme of woman. In India, on the other hand, two personalities, above all, though by no means exclusively, are heard : the voluptuary and the renouncer. This, of course, does not at all necessarily mean that the former will only praise woman and the latter only condemn her, for we know that it is very often those who run after women who despise them most heartily, and any true regard for them must be quite lacking in such men ; and whether we are friendly inclined or otherwise towards the sex, it offers the keen observer so rich and varied a material that in this case a wholly one-sided view or even a feeling of boredom is only possible to a narrow head and heart. The Hindu shows, indeed, a keen observation at all times when he has to do with the way of the world ; that is why hardly any other people has so great a proverbial wisdom ; and there has been no want in India of moderate men, standing rather between the extremes.

Thus it is that the Indian in particular, in his views on woman and love, has from very early times shown that capacity for living in earnest, for ethics, for healthy feeling, which with him ever and again in other fields, too, makes itself felt through every kind of dissoluteness : on filth and corruption it will not seldom bring forth to the light of day even sweet flowers of lovely colours. So it is that woman, above all as a loving wife and tender mother—woman, that is, in her most natural and fairest calling—has nowhere else found greater and more heartfelt appreciation ; in most literatures, indeed, there is far less. Let anyone, for instance, set what has been

written in Old India beside what was written in the Middle Ages, or beside Romance, in particular old and even modern French literature ; in spite of so many, not always edifying, though nearly always interesting refinements, there is wafted to us from the world of the Old Indian books a deeply ethical spirit, one might even say a wholesomeness, which has a very pleasing effect in contrast with the so often empty frivolity—the nauseating filthiness and vulgarity—that meets us out of those other literatures. To put it otherwise and not to wander abroad: the Old Indian loose tales, indeed, in spite of the cautionary thread running all through them, have not been trimmed and put together by literary tailors working for girls' schools ; and yet they are like real moral straitwaistcoats, when compared with a great many of the more or less highly praised productions of the later and latest German writers.

It is now well known, and it has been stressed by many with a special knowledge of India, that these two great Epics still exert an influence to-day on the mind and the life of the Hindu people like no other literary work.[1] There is the further fact that the literature of the " post-Epic " times is often very greatly dependent on the Epic, or influenced in many places by it. Owing to these inner relations between the Epic and the Classical literature, there thus arises, furthermore, a far-reaching indirect influence. What Indian woman (to speak only of the obvious) did not know and honour Sītā and Sāvitrī and other heroines of the Epic poems !

The Epic, however, in many respects only gives us very fragmentary information about woman and her life and the value set on her among the Old Indians. But in general it is only a section of Old Indian life that is opened before us in the Epic poems. How much, indeed, do we learn as to the great mass of the people ! The warrior and the Brahman take all

[1] So J. C. Oman, *The Great Indian Epic*, London, 1906, p. 1 ff. ; Nisikantha Chattopādhyāya in his *Indian Essays* ; Sister Nivedita, *The Web of Indian Life*, London, 1906, pp. 95–115 ; Rāmakrishṇa, *Life in an Indian Village*, London, 1891, p. 142 ff. ; Basanta Koomar Roy, *Rabindra Nath Tagore* (New York, 1915), p. 28 ; W. Crooke, *The North-Western Provinces of India* (London, 1897), p. 256.

our attention for themselves. I sing arms and the priest! But happily there is incidentally a lot more besides in those huge works, and on our theme, too. Poetry can do without the husbandman and the burgher, but take away woman and you cut its very life away.

But however important woman is, her entry into the city of life is seldom hailed on this earth with hosannas and palm-strewn roads; nor is she met with the blare of trumpets that joyfully greets the warrior-hero.[1] She is neither a world-

[1] How unwelcome girls are among the various peoples and tribes has been, of course, often described. It will be enough to refer to Ploss-Bartels, *Das Weib in der Natur- und Völkerkunde*[4], i, 247 ff., ii, 473; and Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*[3], London, 1901, p. 311 ff.; Elsie Clews Parsons, *The Old-Fashioned Woman*, 201 ff. On India see, for instance, Rāmabai Sarasvati, *The High Caste Hindu Woman*, and Billington, *Woman in India*, p. 1 ff.; James Tod, *Rajasthan* (that is, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, popular ed., Calcutta), i, 670 ff.; S. C. Bose, *The Hindoos as They Are* (1881), pp. 24, 28, 216 ff.; Bulloram Mullick, *Home Life in Bengal*, p. 68, 103. The Arabs before Mohammed seem to be the most brutal among the barbarians, for they simply buried girl-children alive. Hauri, *Der Islam*, p. 8; Finck, *Primitive Love and Love Stories*, p. 32; Schweiger-Lerchenfeld, *Die Frauen des Orients*, 63 f.; Hartmann, *Zeitsch. d. Vereins f. Volkskunde*, Bd. ii, p. 240; Welhausen, *Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1893, p. 458; and, above all, *Anthropos*, Bd. iii, p. 62 ff. A sentence in this last may be given here, which could have been written of far too many other places on the earth: Il est d'usage parmi les Bedouins que quand un garçon vient au monde, il est annoncé à la famille et à tous les voisins par des cris de joie qui se répètent d'une tente à l'autre, mais quand c'est une fille qui vient augmenter le nombre des membres de la famille on garde le silence le plus absolu, accompagné de toutes les marques de la tristesse, qu'on laisse voir à tout le monde (p. 65). When we find here too the statement that many beat the poor wife that has brought a girl into the world, we may also refer perhaps to Fr. S. Krauss, *Sitte und Brauch der Südslaven* (1885), p. 540 f., and also to p. 592 ff.

According to McLennan's theory (*Primitive Marriage*, especially p. 75 ff.) that once all the peoples of the world were exogamous owing to girl-killing, all tribes and hordes must then have done away with their daughters—an unexampled piece of nonsense. As an opposite example, the Abipones of Paraguay may be named, who

redeemer nor a world-shaker, but Saṃsārahetu, the "source of the world", the cause of the Sansara, in which, as the Indian says, pleasure, and above all the pleasure of love, is but pain. The birth of a daughter is in general not an object of his wishes. Thus xii, 243.20, says: "The eldest brother is the same as the father, wife and son are a man's own body, his servants are the man's shadow, the daughter is the bitterest woe." And i, 159.11: "The son is his very self, the wife a friend, but the daughter is known for a misfortune." [1] We can thus well understand that among the dreadful omens boding the many deaths in the fight between the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas, this one, too, appears: "Many women will bear four and five girls"—and probably at one birth (vi, 3.7). Not to mention anything else, it is only the son who can bring his forbears that offering so absolutely needed for happiness in the other world. With a daughter this can only be done indirectly—through her sons. And that is always an unsure thing. For against wedding with such a maiden advice is given by the Epic (xiii, 44.15), as also by the Smṛiti or law literature.[2] But whatever the event, the important thing is to marry the girl off fittingly. And here there lies a source of sorrow for the parents. Thus in v, 97.15, 16, we hear the wretched father of the marriageable daughter call out "Shame on the coming of a daughter into the house of men of strong character, who are distinguished, praiseworthy, and of kind disposition. The mother's kindred, the father's, and they to whom she is given—three families—are brought to danger by the daughter of

mainly killed the boys, as a wife had to be bought for them, while the girls could be profitably disposed of. Finck, *Primitive Love*, p. 587. Marriage by purchase, not very honourable in itself, has yet been of much effect in enhancing the value of daughters and wife.

[1] Cf. Weber's *Indische Studien*, v, p. 260, 265; Windisch, *Buddhas Geburt*, etc., p. 60; Winternitz, *Gesch. d. ind. Liter.*, i, 184; Çukranīti (ed. Oppert), iii, 520–3; Otto Stein, *Megasthenes u. Kautilya* (Vienna, 1921), 68, note 3; J. J. Meyer, *Kauṭilya*, 480.3–4; addit. 480.37; also Schrader, *Die Indogermanen*, 101 f.; Feist, *Kultur, Ausbreitung u. Herkunft d. Indogermanen* (1913), p. 108; 299 f.

[2] Manu, iii, 11; Gautama, xxviii, 20; Yājñavalkya, i, 53.

good men." For no one knows how things will go, whether the bride will lead a good life, or bring happiness.[1] What, indeed, shows itself most is the anxiety whether a bridegroom will be found who will do honour through his blood, character, and so forth. This is what we often find in the Mahābhārata, and so, for instance, Rām., vii, 9.10–11 : "To be the father of a daughter is an affliction for him that seeks after honour, and no one knows who will (or shall) take a maiden to his house ; thus it is, O daughter. The mother's kindred, the father's, and they to whom she goes in marriage—three families are brought ever into danger by a daughter." Essentially the same thought is uttered by a harassed father who goes about trying to find a husband for his daughter, in the 12th sarga, çl. 11–12. It is well known that in India often the whole family will ruin itself in the endeavour to find a thoroughly good match for the daughter, and give her a wedding befitting its standing.[2] Having regard to all the evils brought down by a daughter, we very easily understand why the Hindu often hails her without much joy. But the love for children, which is so strong in the Indian, is also felt towards her, and so Bāṇa very finely declares that the parents are saddened at the birth of a girl, as they think of the day when a bridegroom will rob them of the loved one.[3] And little light as the Epic throws on

[1] Cp. Jāt., Nos. 102, 217 (it is not known how the daughter bids to fare in the husband's house). An eloquent description of the sorrows and woes a daughter gives her parents from birth, on account of her marriage, is to be found in Bose, *The Hindoos as They Are* (1881), p. 219 ff. ; Bulloram Mullick, *Home Life in Bengal*, p. 108 ff.

[2] This costs at least 200 dollars in the upper classes (Rāmabai Sarasvatī, p. 12), and even the peasant weddings are dear (cp. Sir B. Fuller, *Studies of Indian Thought and Sentiment*, London, 1910, p. 155 f.). On the Rājput see especially Tod, *Rajasthan*, i, p. 672 ff.

[3] Harshacarita, translated by Cowell and Thomas, p. 122. A beautiful picture is given in MBh., iii, 32.60–63 : King Drupada has his sons taught the prudent way of life by a wise Brahman who lives as a guest in his house. The father sits there, and when his little daughter comes with any message or errand he lifts her up onto his lap, and she listens eagerly to the teacher's words. He then speaks coaxing words to her, and the little girl, to supplement these crumbs she has caught up, gets from her brothers a repetition of the master's

the life of the unwedded girl, yet we may take to be true for the Epic world what is told us of the happy time spent by the Indian girl before she goes to her husband's house in, for instance, Ramabai Sarasvati, *The High Caste Hindu Woman* (London, 1890), p. 23, and the far too romantic Sister Nivedita, *The Web of Indian Life* (London, 1906),p. 35. Thus we read of the merry game which the girls enjoyed in the evening in the pleasure groves (Rām., ii, 67.17 ; cf. 71.22). The ball-game of the grown-up girls, often referred to in the Classical literature, and described at such length in the Daçakumāracaritam (p. 290 ff. of my translation), is also found in the Epic. Çāntā plays ball in iii, 111.16. The small girls, too, amuse themselves in this way (v, 90.63). The balls used would seem to have been very finely coloured, at any rate those of the upper classes (iii, 112.10).[1] Bhīshma declares : "The son is as one's very self ; the daughter is like the son. How could it be, so long as she is alive, that any other should have the property ? " (xiii, 45.11). Then he sets forth

wisdom, doubtless told very solemnly. How greatly the daughter is loved is described, too, e.g. in Leumann, *Die Nonne, ein Roman aus d. alten Indien*, strophe 107 ff., 125 ff., 423 ff. ; Kupabai Satthianadhu, *Kamala* (Leipzig, 1898), p. 120. Of the Rājput we are told by James Tod, *Rajasthan* (*Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, first popular ed., Calcutta), that there are few among even the lowest of the chiefs whose daughters are not taught to read and write (i, p. 676). So, too, Shib Chunder Bose, *The Hindoos as They Are*, p. 226. But see, for instance, Ramabai Sarasvati, p. 57.

[1] How the ball-game befitted the fascination of a young girl, and how she strengthened her conquest by it is to be gathered, too, from Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, viii, 12.15 ff. : Rudra or Çiva comes on a visit to Vishṇu. The latter by his Māyā (magic) calls up a bewitchingly fair maiden, who plays at ball, and whose garments are carried off by the wind. Although Çiva's wife is beside him he rushes up to the charmer and then goes after her as she wrests herself from his grip ; in the pursuit *semen ejus ejicitur*. It goes, of course, without saying that in the Epic the girl plays with dolls. But when Hopkins, because Uttarā still took pleasure in this at the time of her marriage, concludes she was still in her childhood, he makes a mistake. Cf. Billington, *Woman in India*, p. 215 ; Çrīvara's Kathākautukam, Sanskrit and German by R. Schmidt, vi, 15, 48, 69.

that the mother's own portion falls to the lot of the girl ; the property shall be inherited by the daughter's son from the father that has no sons. For he bestows the ancestral food-cakes for his own father and for his mother's father. In law there is no difference between one's own son and the daughter's son. The daughter, too, takes precedence of the son that is born elsewhere, that is, who is not the son of the body ; according to the commentary, she takes three-fifths of the estate. So we find in xiii, 47.25 f. : "That which was given by her father to the wife from the Brahman caste, O Yudhishṭhira, shall be taken by the daughter. For she is equal to the son." [1]

[1] There is no distinction between son's son and daughter's son (Manu, ix, 130 ; Vishṇu, xv, 47). If there are no sons, and also the mother is dead, then the daughter inherits the father's property, and no one else ; for she is sprung from his body just like the son (Nārada, xiii, 50 ; Bṛihaspati, xxv, 55 ff. ; Yājñavalkya, ii, 135 f. ; Vishṇu, xvii, 4 ff.). But cp. Āpastamba, ii, 6, 14, 2–6 ; Gautama, xxviii, 21 ff. ; Vasishṭha, xvii, 81 ff. ; Manu, ix, 185 ff. (and Bühler's notes on it, SBE, xxv, p. 365). So the Mahānirvāṇatantra, xii, 36, states that the daughter of the man without wife or son gets the father's inheritance, even if there is a brother of the father's ; and according to 55 the daughter-in-law or the granddaughter inherits before the dead man's own father. According to Vishṇu, xviii, 34 f., the mother and the unmarried daughter get a share of the man's estate according to the son's share (putrabhāgānusāreṇa), that is to say, exactly so much as the sons who are equal to them in the caste have the right to inherit, an arrangement, therefore, which provides for a testator with wives of differing castes, and probably only for one without a son. If the father share out his estate himself, then according to Nārada, xiii, 13, the unwedded daughter receives as much as the sons between the eldest and youngest. But cp. Bṛihaspati, xxv, 64 ; Manu, ix, 118 ; Yājñav., ii, 124 (the brothers must give the unwedded sisters a fourth part of their own share). According to Yāska's Nirukta, iii, 4, the children inherit equally, regardless of sex (see Bühler's Manu, p. lxi). The woman's estate or mother's own property (strīdhana, yautuka) falls to her daughter. Vishṇu, xvii, 18 ff. ; Gautama, xxviii, 24 ; Baudhāyana, ii, 2, 3, 43 ; Yājñavalkya, ii, 143–5 ; Agnipurāṇa, transl. by Manmatha Nath Dutt, p. 925, etc. Cp., too, especially Manu, ix, 130–9 ; J. J. Meyer, *Über das Wesen d. altind. Rechtsschriften u. ihr Verhältnis zu einander u. zu Kauṭilya* (Leipzig, 1927), p. 73 ff.

The sight of pretty and well-dressed girls and being greeted by them with festal honour brings good luck if one is minded to take an important step (vii, 82.22 ; cp. 7.9 ; 112.62 ff. ; xiii, 11.14). Eight girls are named as important objects of good luck on the occasion of the preparations for consecrating Rāma as crown-prince (Rām., ii, 14.36) ; and when at last he comes back from exile and marches to his solemn consecration as king, there go before him, as bringing weal : unhusked corn, gold, cows, young girls, and Brahmans, as also men with sugar-cakes in their hands ; and in his sprinkling or initiation into the rank of prince, maidens also take a part, sixteen in number, as the commentator points out (Rām., vi, 128, çl. 38, 62 ; cp. MBh., v, 140, 14 f.).[1] And like other Indian literature the Mahābhārata shows how a man can get a daughter. According to xiii, 87.10, this is brought about through the ancestral offering on the second day of the dark half of the month. There is other information in xiii, 104.151 ; iii, 83.190. See also xiii, 83.51 ; i, 116.12 (a daughter is longed for). This we shall speak of later.

We find even quite spoiled daughters. Thus i, 76 ff., tells us : "The gods and the Dānavas fight with one another for leadership. Çukra, the sacrificial priest of the Dānavas, knows the charm for bringing back life, and keeps on calling back to life the Dānavas who fall in the fight. The sacrificial priest of the gods, Bṛihaspati, cannot do this. So the heaven-dwellers are at a great drawback. They induce Kaca, Bṛihaspati's young son, to go and be a disciple of Çukra, by telling him 'Thou and no other, canst win favour with Devayānī, the beloved daughter of this high-minded one. When once thou hast gladdened Devayānī through a virtuous character, skill, friendliness, right living, and self-control, then thou wilt of a surety win this charm for awakening the dead.'" Çukra takes him. "So as to win the favour of both, the youth would ever

[1] In the body of the wedded and the unwedded woman alike there dwells, too, Çrī, the goddess of happiness and beauty (Vishṇu, xcix, 14), and girls and women also turn aside the "evil eye" (dṛishṭi-parihāra). Cf. Edgar Thurston, *Omens and Superstitions of Southern India* (1912), pp. 15–17, 23, 118. To see women is lucky according to MBh., ix, 56, 24 f.

gladden Devayānī with singing, dancing, and music. He waited on the maiden, who was in her youth, and rejoiced her with flowers, fruits, and services. Devayānī, too, secretly gave careful heed to this Brahman youth who zealously carried out vows and holy works, as she sang and trifled before him." The Dānavas, however, saw him in the forest as he was herding his teacher's cows, questioned him, and killed and cut him up, and gave him to the wolves to eat, all out of enmity towards Bṛihaspati, and in order that the magic for bringing back to life, so useful to them, should not become known to the gods. The cows came back in the evening without their herd. Devayānī saw this, and said to her father: "Evidently Kaca has been killed or has died. Without him I do not want to live; I swear it thee." Çukra made use of his spell for bringing back to life: Kaca broke out of the wolves' bellies, and showed himself hale and whole before the teacher and his daughter. On another day Devayānī sent him into the forest to bring flowers. The Dānavas crushed him, and mixed him up with the sea's waters. And again the teacher called him back to life. But the third time the foes ground him to powder, put it in brandy-wine, and gave the mixture to Çukra to drink. Devayānī spoke and said: "Kaca went forth on my service to bring flowers, and he is no longer to be seen. Clearly he has been slain or is dead. Without Kaca I will not live; that I swear unto thee." The father put it to her that she need not take so much thought of Kaca, since she had the choice of Brahmans, gods, and demons. The luckless fellow, he said, is indeed always being killed. But she exclaimed: "He is chaste, and greatly ascetic, always ready and skilled in all contrivances. I shall follow Kaca, and hunger myself to death. I love the handsome Kaca." So it came to yielding, and her father began his spell. But now came the quandary: the disciple had to obey, and yet could not; for he could not come out of the teacher's belly without, at the same time, bringing death on him. This the anguished one brought to the teacher's knowledge in moving words, speaking from the wizard's body, and telling him how he had been drunk down together with the brandy-wine. Devayānī knew no consolation: "Two sorrows burn me like fire: Kaca's death, and the annihilation

threatening thee. If Kaca dies then there is no salvation for me ; and if thou art destroyed, then I cannot live." But Çukra found a way out : he initiated the disciple into the magic spell, who broke out of the teacher's belly, and brought back the dead man to life again with all speed. Çukra was now filled with anger against the evil brandy-wine, that had brought about the whole misfortune, and forbade it to the Brahman for all time with great solemnity and under dreadful threats of punishment. Kaca now wished to go back to the gods, and took leave of the teacher. Devayānī went to meet him and besought him earnestly to wed her. But he had no wish to, and came out of it by urging that she as his teacher's daughter, was honourable in his sight, and, moreover, was now his sister, since both of them had now abode in Çukra's body. The loving girl, however, made answer : " If thou dost scorn me for love for virtue, although I have asked thee with tears, then this magic knowledge will be nought in thine hands." He told her that he was unwilling only because he would not offend against the old holy laws, and since she had cursed him so unjustly and unfoundedly, her wish would not be fulfilled : no son of a Ṛishi would take her with him as wife.[1] So he went back to the gods, taught them the magic, and they were now made happy. They then exhorted Indra to show his valour. He set forth, but saw maidens bathing in the forest and playing in the water. Then he changed himself into a wind, and tossed their clothes about. When they came out of the water, they took the wrong clothes. The bathing girls were Devayānī and Çarmishṭhā, the daughter of the Daitya prince Vṛishaparvan, together with the princess's followers. Çarmishṭhā happened to lay hold of the clothes of her friend, Devayānī ; the latter rebuked Çarmishṭhā : "Why art thou, my disciple, taking my clothes ? Wicked girl, it will not go well with thee." Çarmishṭhā answered : " Whether my father is sitting or lying down, thy father as a court singer ever praises him, and stands humbly far below. For thou art the daughter of him that begs, that praises, that takes ; I am the daughter of him that is praised, that grants, that never takes.[2] Burn away, hurt

[1] That is, no man of the Brahman caste.

[2] Cp. Baudhāyana's law book, ii, 2, 4.26 (= ii, 2.79–80).

thyself, be abusive, be angered, thou beggar! Thou hast nought, thou art weaponless, and art upset over her that is armed, thou eater of alms. Thou shalt find someone who is a match for thee; thou art nothing to me."[1] Çarmishṭhā, bent on evil, threw Devayānī, who was in a rage of pride,[2] and kept hold of the clothes, into a well, and went back to her town, believing within herself: "She is no more." Without taking any more thought about her, she went into her house filled with mad anger.

Then came thither Yayāti, Nahusha's son, with a wearied team, and wearied horses, hunting after game, and athirśt. Nahusha's son saw the waterless well and saw this maiden in it, like a flame of fire. And when he had seen her he asked the maiden, who was like a goddess, he the beśt among princes asked her, as he reassured her with mośt sweet and soft words: "Who art thou, fair maid, with the red nails and shining jewels and ear-rings?[3] Long and over-much haśt thou been given up to gloomy thoughts. And wherefore dośt thou torture

[1] In the MBh. the man of the warrior nobility is always declaring that his kind does not ask and takes nothing; "grant me," he utters of only one thing: of fighting. Only the Brahmans beg; begging is, indeed, their faithful mate; but the Kshattriya owns and enjoys that only which he has won with his own might. See, for instance, i, 92.13 ff.; iii, 154.10; v, 75.23; 120.19; xii, 199.42, 74, 82, 112. As here, so the warrior, times beyond telling, shows us in the MBh., how removed from the prieśtly class he feels himself, and how deeply his lordly pride scorns it. For this cp., too, the excellent account of Hopkins, JAOS, xiii, 151–62; Fick, *Die soziale Gliederung*, etc., 51 ff., 64. But the nobility is left far and away behind by the mad pretensions of the prieśtly caśte, which has given the poem its present form, and fully indemnifies itself through its one and only weapon—the word, as the MBh. repeatedly points out. Indeed, it has, as is well known, preached the taking of gifts as actually one of its good works, and in xiii, 121.14, we read the pronouncement: "The taker wins the same merit as the giver; for nothing rolls on one wheel, as the holy seers know." It is only the beśtower then, that owes thankfulness; he is given the chance to win high religious blessing by deeds.

[2] Samucchraya. Cp. vi, 44.6, where, however, "high-billowing fight" would also fit in, and vi, 99.29, where the word = yuddha.

[3] Or, ear-rings of precious śtones.

thyself with care? And how hast thou fallen into this plant- and grass-covered well? And whose daughter art thou? Speak the truth, maiden with the lovely waist!" Devayānī spoke: "I am that Çukra's daughter, he who brings back to life again the Daityas slain by the gods. He knows of a surety nothing about me. Here is my right hand with its red-nailed fingers. Take me, and draw me out. For I know thou art of noble birth. I can see in thee a man of calm soul, of bravery, and of renown. Therefore mayest thou draw me, who have fallen in here, out of this well." When the king, Nahusha's son, had learned she was a Brahman's daughter, he took her by the right hand and pulled her out of that pit. And when the prince Yayāti had pulled her quickly out of this well, he took his leave of the fair-hipped one, and went off to his town. When Nahusha's son had gone, Devayānī, the spotless one, spoke, torn with grief, to her handmaid, Ghūrṇikā, who had come from the town: "Ghūrṇikā, go quickly and tell my father: 'I shall not set foot now any more in the town of Vṛishaparvan.'" Ghūrṇikā went quickly into the Asura's castle, and when she saw Çukra she spoke to him with a soul filled with emotion, told the very wise one that Devayānī had been slain in the forest by Çarmishṭhā, the daughter of Vṛishaparvan. When Çukra heard that his daughter had been slain there in the forest by Çarmishṭhā, he hastened out filled with woe, looking for his child. Then when Çukra had seen his daughter in the forest, he clasped her in his arms and spoke the words: "Through their own misdeeds (in an earlier being) all men do compel happiness and unhappiness to themselves.[1] I think thou hast done some evil, and the punishment for it has been thus inflicted." Devayānī spoke: "Never mind about punishment! Listen carefully to me: Is it true what Çarmishṭhā, daughter of Vṛishaparvan, said unto me? She said thou wert the singer of the Daityas. That is what I was told by Çarmishṭhā, Vṛishaparvan's daughter, in sharp, bitter words, with her eyes deep-reddened by anger: 'Thou art but the

[1] Or simply: bring on themselves. Niyacchati=get for oneself, obtain, is often found in the MBh. (for instance, iii, 207.66; v, 64.19; 72.62; 163.41; vii, 199.33; xii, 290.24; 307.40; xiii, 48.42 f.; xiii, 57.21; 59.21; 143.51; xv, 34.8).

daughter of him that praises ; that ever asks and accepts ; but I am the daughter of him that is praised, that bestows and never accepts.' That is what Çarmishṭhā, Vṛishaparvan's daughter, said to me over and over again with anger-reddened eyes and filled with pride. Father, if I am the daughter of him that praises and accepts, then will I beg forgiveness of Çarmishṭhā. That I have said to my friend." Çukra spoke : "Thou art not the daughter of one that praises, that asks, that accepts ; the daughter thou art of one that praises not, of one that is praised, Devayānī. Vṛishaparvan knows that, and Indra and King Yayāti. For the Brahman that is beyond all thinking and has nothing twofold is my kingly power.[1] And whatever there be anywhere in heaven and earth,[2] I am ever proclaimed as its lord by the rejoicing, self-sprung being (Brahma). I make the water to flow for the weal of creatures, I make all plants to grow. This truth I swear unto thee." Thus in friendly wise did the father speak in sweet, gentle words to this girl that had fallen into doubt, that was tortured with indignation : "Let that human being, that bears ever with patience the taunting speech of others, know, O Devayānī, that he has won this All. He that bridles his rising anger, like a steed, that one is called a leader by the good, not he who pulls at the horse's reins. He that drives forth his rising anger by his freedom from anger, know, O Devayānī, that such a one has overcome this All. He that throws off his rising anger by a mild patience, as the snake does its old skin, such a one is indeed called a man. He that holds his ill-humour in check, he that calmly bears evil report, and he that, when he is tormented, does not torment, such a one is indeed a vessel of profit. If one man, month by month through a hundred years, without wearying, makes sacrifice, and another is not angered by anything (or : against anyone), then of the two he that is not angered is the greater. If boys and girls heedlessly weave enmity, the wise man shall not imitate them ; for they do not know what strength and weakness is." Devayānī spoke :

[1] Or : for the holy knowledge beyond all thought is my lordship and strength (or, warlike power) without rival. Cp. xii, 141.64.

[2] Or, less likely : and that which in heaven and on earth is the everywhere existing something ("the thing-in-itself").

"Father, though I am but a young girl, yet I know what the difference is on earth between the duties. And as to not being angered, and as to speech, I know what strength is and what weakness is. But that a pupil should bear himself unlike such, that, indeed, none should suffer who would fain be of any worth. Therefore it pleases me not to dwell among such as bring the rightful way into confusion, for the wise man striving after his weal shall not dwell among ill-minded folk that by their behaviour and origin are a stumbling-block unto others. But those that by their behaviour and origin grant him acknowledgment, among good men such as these shall he dwell; this is called the best abode. The dreadful evil, spoken by Vṛishaparvan's daughter in her words, tears my heart, as he that seeks fire tears the kindling-wood. For I deem nothing in the three worlds to be harder than to look, when robbed of fame and happiness, on the fame and happiness of the rival. Death is the best thing for such a one, as those that know acknowledge."

Thereupon Çukra, the best among the race of the Bhṛigus, went, ill-pleased, and, without further thought, spoke as follows to Vṛishaparvan on his throne: "The evil that has been done does not at once bring forth its fruit, like the earth (gaur iva); slowly rolling along, it gnaws at the roots of the doer. In the sons and grandsons, if he does not feel it in himself, the evil, of a surety, makes itself known, like something heavy which a man has eaten, in the body.[1] Since thou didst kill the Brahman Kaca then, the Angiras who did no evil, who knew virtue, was obedient, and rejoiced in my family, because of the murder of that innocent one and because of the murder of my daughter—hear me, O Vṛishaparvan—I leave thee and thy kindred. I cannot dwell together with thee in thy kingdom, O king. Ah! thou takest me for an empty chatterer, O Daitya, that thou dost not hold back from this sin of thine, but dost look on it calmly." Vṛishaparvan spoke: "I know of no evil and no empty words in thee, O son of Bhṛigu; in thee do dwell righteousness and truth. Therefore grant us mercy and forgiveness. If thou leavest us and goest forth, we shall leap into the sea, we have no other refuge." Çukra spoke: "Leap into

[1] Cp. xii, 91.21; 95.17–18; 139.22; Manu, iv, 172–3.

the sea, or flee in all directions of the heavens, O ye Asuras! I can brook no insult to my daughter, for I love her. Soften the heart of Devayānī, in whom my life is wrapped, and I will bring thee welfare and peace, as Bṛihaspati did to Indra." Vṛishaparvan spoke: "All that the princes of the Asuras have on earth to hold, all their elephants, cattle, and horses, of these all thou art the lord, and also of me." Çukra spoke: "If I am lord of whatsoever the Daitya princes own, O great Asura, then let Devayānī be appeased." Thus addressed, Vṛishaparvan spoke: "So let it be!" The son of Bhṛigu, he the great wise one, went to Devayānī and explained this matter to her. Devayānī spoke: "I will not believe it from thee that thou art lord over the king's possessions, but the king himself must say it." Vṛishaparvan spoke: "Whatever thou dost wish, O bright-smiling one, that will I give thee, even if it be sore hard to get." Devayānī spoke: "I wish for Çarmishṭhā as my slave together with a thousand girls, and she shall follow me wheresoever my father gives me in marriage." Vṛishaparvan spoke: "Arise, go, O nurse, and quickly bring Çarmishṭhā hither. And whatever the bidding of Devayānī, that shall she do." Thereupon the nurse went away and spoke the words to Çarmishṭhā: "Arise, dear Çarmishṭhā, and bring happiness to thine. The Brahman is indeed wont to dismiss his pupils, if Devayānī urges him to it. Whatever Devayānī bids of thee, that thou must now do, O kindly one." Çarmishṭhā spoke: "Whatever her bidding, that will I now do, if Çukra so calls on me for the sake of Devayānī. Çukra shall not go forth through my fault, nor shall Devayānī because of me." Thereupon in her mildness, at her father's bidding, with a thousand girls about her she hastily left the fair city. Çarmishṭhā spoke: "I am thy slave with a thousand slave-girls, thy servant. I will follow thee, wheresoever thy father gives thee in marriage." Devayānī spoke: "I am for thee the daughter of him that praises, begs, accepts. How can it be that the daughter of him that is praised becomes the slave?" Çarmishṭhā spoke: "By whatever the means, well-being must be found for the afflicted kindred. Therefore will I follow thee wheresoever thy father gives thee in marriage."

When Vṛishaparvan's daughter had promised to be a slave,

Devayānī spoke to her father the words : " I will go unto the city, O father ; I am satisfied, O best among the twice-born. Thy knowledge and the power of thine art is not for nothing." [1] Thus addressed by his daughter, the greatest among the Brahmans, the very famous one, went, rejoiced and honoured by all the Dānavas, into the city.

Some time later Devayānī of the lovely face went into that selfsame forest to play. Together with these thousand slave-girls and Çarmishṭhā she came there to that selfsame spot and wandered about to her heart's desire, accompanied by all these followers, filled with great joy, as all played merrily,[2] drank sweet heady drinks, ate cakes of many kinds, and partook of fruits. And once again there happened to come hunting this way Nahusha's son, the king, craving for water, and worn out with weariness. He saw Devayānī and Çarmishṭhā and these fair young girls drinking and sporting, decked with god-like ornaments. And he saw Devayānī of the bright smile, the woman above others, of incomparable form, sitting among these maidens, waited on by Çarmishṭhā, who was rubbing her feet and doing other services. Yayāti spoke : " Two maidens surrounded by two thousand maidens ! I ask family and name of both of you, O fair ladies." Devayānī spoke : " I will tell thee. Hearken unto my words, O Prince of men ! Çukra is the name of the teacher of the Asuras. Know then, that I am his daughter. And she there is my friend and slave who follows me everywhere—Çarmishṭhā, the daughter of the king of the Dānavas, Vṛishaparvan." Yayāti spoke : " But how comes it that this fair-faced maiden, the daughter of the Asura king, she with the lovely brows, is thy friend and slave ? I am very curious as to this." Devayānī spoke : " Every one, O best of men, obeys his fate. Look on it as the gift of fate, and do not make divers speeches. Thy form and garb are as those of a king, and thou speakest the speech of the Brahmans (Sanskrit). Who and whence art thou, and whose son ? Tell me." Yayāti spoke : " As a pupil of the Brahmans I have heard the whole Veda, I am a king and a

[1] Or : Thy worldly knowledge is not for nothing, and thou hast the power of the holy teaching (or : of magical knowledge).

[2] Perhaps more nearly : as all found their pleasure in play.

king's son, famous under the name of Yayāti." Devayānī spoke: "Why didst thou come this way? Wouldst thou take something dwelling in the water, or hunt the gazelle?" Yayāti spoke: "While hunting gazelle, O kindly one, I came hither for water. But now thou hast well questioned me.[1] Give me leave, therefore, to go." Devayānī spoke: "With two thousand girls and my slave Çarmishṭhā I am at thy bidding. Prithee, be my friend and my husband." Yayāti spoke: "Know thou, O daughter of Uçana, an it please thee, I am not worthy of thee, O lovely one. For thy father cannot be father-in-law to kings." Devayānī spoke: "The warrior nobility is closely bound to the Brahmans, the Brahmans are linked with the warrior nobility. Come now, son of Nahusha, do thou wed me as a Ṛishi and a Ṛishi's son." Yayāti spoke: "Although the four castes, O fair woman, come from one body, yet have they varying duties and varying rules for purity; of them the Brahman is the first." Devayānī spoke: "Such a hand-grasp (as thine) men have not so far practised. Thou didst grasp my hand before, therefore do I ask of thee to be my husband. How should another now touch the hand of me, the proud one, the hand that has been grasped by thee, the son of a Ṛishi, and a Ṛishi himself!" Yayāti spoke: "As more dangerous than an angry, flaming, venomous snake, everywhere darting, must the Brahman be recognized by the understanding man." Devayānī spoke: "Why sayest thou, O prince of men: More dangerous than a flaming, venomous snake, everywhere darting, is the Brahman?" Yayāti spoke: "The venomous snake kills one man, and with a weapon one man alone is slain; the Brahman destroys even cities and kingdoms, when he is angered. Therefore do I hold the Brahman as more dangerous, O timid one. And therefore I will not wed thee, unless thy father gives thee to me." Devayānī spoke: "Wed me, then, O king, when my father has given me thee, and I have chosen thee. For him that asks not, and only takes her that is given him, there is no danger." Quickly the nurse then faithfully told Devayānī's father all that Devayānī had entrusted her with for him. And so soon as

[1] Or: But I am very pressed (I have urgent business: bahudhāpy anuyukto 'smi). The expression is found several times in the MBh.

the scion of the Bhṛigu had heard, he appeared before the king. And when Yayāti, the lord of the earth, saw Çukra coming, he showed honour unto the Brahman, the son of Kavi, and stood there with folded hands, humbly bowed. Devayānī spoke: "This, O father, is the king, son of Nahusha. When I was in evil plight, he clasped my hand. Honour be to thee. Give me to him. I will choose no other husband in the world." Çukra spoke: "Chosen by this my beloved daughter, take her for thy chief wife; I give her thee, O son of Nahusha." Yayāti spoke: "May this great hurt done to the law that comes from the mingling of the castes not be avenged here on me, O scion of the Bhṛigu. On this condition I take thee, O Brahman, as father-in-law." Çukra spoke: "I absolve thee from the hurt to the law. Choose for thyself a favour thou wouldst have. Do not be despondent on account of this marriage.[1] I will drive the evil away from thee. Take thou the slender Devayānī home as thy wife according to the law and custom, and with her win incomparable joy. And this maiden, too, Vṛishaparvan's daughter, Çarmishṭhā, shalt thou always honour, O king; and do not call her onto thy bed." Thus addressed, King Yayāti walked round Çukra to the right, and celebrated the happy wedding in the way laid down by the books of instruction. After he had got from Çukra many things and the most splendid Devayānī, together with two thousand girls and Çarmishṭhā, and had been honoured by Çukra and the Daityas, the best of princes came into his city, filled with joy, having taken leave of the high-minded one."

The good daughter whom we have just seen in Çarmishṭhā we find also elsewhere. It is now the turn of a Brahman, with whom the five fugitive Pāṇḍava youths are living, to offer himself to an evil Rākshasa. The latter must be given every day a cartload of rice to eat, the two oxen drawing it, and the man driving them. After the wife has offered to die for the Brahman, it goes on (i, 159):—

"When the daughter heard the words of the overwhelmingly saddened parents, she spoke unto them, her body clasped in grief: 'Why do ye weep as bitterly as those beyond

[1] Literally: at this marriage thou shalt not wilt, that is, probably: do thou not be weary, have no fear.

hope, tortured by a mighty sorrow? Listen unto my words and then do what is befitting. By all that is right, ye two shall give me up; of that there is no doubt. By giving me, who do consent, thou shalt save all through me, a single person. This is why offspring are wished for: 'They shall save me.' Since now the time for it has drawn nigh, cross, with me as the vessel, over the misfortune. Here and after death he must rescue from danger. In every way the son must sacrifice himself. That is why he is called son by the wise.[1] And the ancestors yearn ever for daughter's sons from me. So will I myself save them by shielding my father's life. But if thou goest into that world, then this my small brother will soon perish; of that there is no doubt. And if my father should have come into heaven, and my younger brother gone to destruction, then the gift of cakes for the ancestors would be cut short; and that would be a misfortune for them. Robbed thus of my father, and of my mother and brother, I should surely die, falling from one sorrow into a greater, for I am not used to such things as this. But if thou hast escaped, safe and sound, then assuredly my mother and brother, the child and the family line, and the offering to the forbears will be preserved and kept. The son is the very self, the wife a friend, but, as all know, the daughter is ever a misfortune (kṛicchra). . . But if I carry out the liberation, then my death will bear fruit, after I have carried through a very heavy task. But if thou goest thither, O best among Brahmans, and dost leave me behind, then shall I be in straits; therefore look, too, to me. Save thyself for our sake, and for the sake of religious duty, and for the sake of the offspring, and give up me, who am ready for it. And now let not the time go by for this most necessary deed. Indeed, what greater misfortune could there be than that we, after thy going home, should run round like dogs begging food from strangers? But if thou and our kinsfolk are set free from this calamity, sound and unhurt, then I shall live in happiness, as one that has not died in the world. As a result the gods will work well-being because of the sacrifices, and, as we have heard, so will the

[1] This is how I try to render the etymological word-play that is found countless times: puttra from put + trā.

ancestors for the sake of the water-offering brought by thee." [1]

In the Rāmāyaṇa, in the 17th Sarga of the 7th Book, we read: "Thereupon Rāvaṇa, the strong-armed, wandered over the earth, and when he had come into the wilderness of Himavant, he went about in it. Then he saw a maiden wearing a black antelope-skin and penitent's tresses, taken up with the work of the holy ones (asceticism), and shining like a goddess. When he saw this maiden with the gift of beauty engaged in very heavy mortification, he laughed a little, and with senses blinded by love he asked: "Wherefore dost thou do this work, that is in discord with thy youth? For it does not befit thee thus to act against this beauty. Thy peerless beauty, O timid one, which arouses mad love among men, is not there to the end that thou shouldst be given up to mortification. That is an evident conclusion. Whom dost thou belong to? Wherefore this task? And who is thy husband, thou with the fair face? Whoever enjoys thee, he is a happy man on earth. Tell me all I ask. Wherefore the weariness?" Thus addressed by Rāvaṇa the glorious maiden spoke, after she, the penitent, had shown him due and proper hospitality: "Kuçadhvaja was the name of my father, the Brahman Ṛishi of boundless fame, the majestic son of Bṛihaspati, equal in soul to Bṛihaspati. To this high-minded one, ever given up to Veda study, I was born as daughter out of his words, and Vedavatī is the name I bear. Then there came gods and Gandharvas, Yakshas, and Rākshasas, and snake-demons to my father and deigned to woo me. But my father did not give me to them, O Rākshasa prince. I will tell thee why. Hearken, O strong-armed one. My father would fain have Vishṇu, the lord of the three worlds, as son-in-law. Therefore my father would give me to no other. But when the prince of the Daityas, Çambhu his name, heard of this, he was angry with him who boasted his might. This villain did evil to my father in the night, as he slept. Then my excellent mother,

[1] I read naḥ instead of na. The text, after the commentator, means: But if thou dost say: "We have heard that the gods and ancestors, when there is such an offering (of the daughter by her own father), do not work well-being," (then I say) "they do assuredly work well-being through the water-offering made by thee."

deep stricken, clasped my father's body, and went thus into the fire. With the resolve : " I will make this wish of my father's, directed to Nārāyaṇa, a true thing," I carry this god now in my heart. Now that I have undertaken this vow I am carrying out a mighty penance. With this I have told thee all, O Rākshasa prince. Nārāyaṇa will be my husband, and none but Purushottama. Thus I am giving myself up to dreadful ascetic vows in the yearning for Nārāyaṇa. I know thee, O king. Go, son of Paulastya. Through my asceticism I know all that is in the three worlds." Rāvaṇa spoke once more to the maiden in the midst of her heavy penance, climbing down from his chariot of the gods and stricken with the dart of love : " Thou art haughty, O fair-hipped one, to cherish such a resolve. The storing up of virtuous merit is something praiseworthy for old folk, O gazelle-eyed one. But thou, O timid one, that art favoured with every gift, and art the beauty of the three worlds, must not speak thus. Thy youthful bloom is fleeting. I am the prince of Laṅkā, dear one, famed under the name of Daçagrīva. Come, be my wife ; take thy fill of pleasures as thy heart may wish. And who is he thou callest Vishṇu ? In valour, asceticism, wealth, strength, O dear one, he is not my equal, whom thou, O fair one, yearnest after." But as he thus spoke, this maiden Vedavatī made answer to the night-spirit : " No, do not speak thus ! Who with any understanding but thee, O Rākshasa prince, could wish to scorn Vishṇu, the overlord of the three worlds, held in honour by the whole world ? " Thus addressed by Vedavatī, the night-spirit clutched the maiden by the hair with his fingers. Then Vedavatī, filled with anger, cut off her hair with her hand ; her hand became a sword, and cut the hair away. As though aflame with wrath, as though burning up the night-spirit, having laid a fire, she spoke, filled with haste to die : " Since shame has been put on me by thee, thou base one, I will not live. O Rakshas, that is why I go before thine eyes into the fire. Since I have had shame put on me by thee, evil-minded one, in the forest, therefore will I be born again to thy destruction. For a woman cannot slay the man bent on evil. And should I utter my curse on thee, then my mortification would come to nought. But if I have won any merit through deed, gift, and

sacrifice, so may I as the fruit of it become the good daughter, not born of mother's womb, of a pious man." As soon as she had spoken thus, she went into the glowing fire, and from the sky there fell around a heavenly rain of flowers. And she was born here as the daughter of King Janaka (as Sītā from the furrow)."

And in other ways, too, it is not always easy for the daughter in the Old India of the Epic. So it is when a Brahman comes as guest ; for this caste demands, especially in the Mahābhārata, the most humble services. In iii, 303 ff., we read :—

" Once to King Kuntibhoja there came a Brahman, strong as glowing fire, and very tall,[1] with a moustache, a staff, and plaits, stately, with faultless limbs, glowing, as it were, with fiery strength, yellow as honey, a sweet speaker, decked with asceticism and holy studies. This very great penitent spoke to King Kuntibhoja : " I wish to enjoy alms in thy house, thou unselfish one. Nothing that is unpleasing to me must be done to me, either by thee, or by thy followers. Under these conditions I will dwell in thy house, thou blameless one, if so it please thee. And I will go and come entirely at my own will, and as to bed and seat none shall be remiss therewith." To him spoke Kuntibhoja these kind and joyful words : " So let it be, and it is right well." And again he spoke to him : " I have a daughter, O wise man, Pṛithā her name ; glorious is the fair one, attended by virtue and a surpassing life, kind and dutiful.[2] She will serve thee with reverence and without disdain, and for her virtuous ways thou wilt be content with her." When he had so spoken unto the Brahman, and had done him honour as it is ordained, he went to the maiden Pṛithā of the great eyes and spoke to her : " My child, this most excellent Brahman wishes to dwell in my house, and I have granted it him with a yea, looking confidently to thee for the contentment of the Brahman. Therefore mayst thou never belie my words. This is a holy penitent, a Brahman who is earnestly set on the study of the Veda. Whatever the most powerful one may ask must be ungrudgingly granted him. For the Brahman is the highest power, the Brahman is the highest

[1] Or : standing up high.
[2] Or : self-controlled.

asceticism ; it is through the honouring of Brahmans that the sun shines in the sky. For as the great Asura Vātāpi did not honour those worthy of honour, he was struck down by the Brahman's staff,[1] and Tālajaṅgha likewise. With this a great task is now set thee, my child ; do thou bring content to the Brahman with constant heedfulness. I know, O daughter, thy zealous regard for all Brahmans here and for the dignitaries and kinsfolk, shown by thee from childhood days. So also dost thou show thyself towards all servants, towards friends, marriage-kin, and thy mothers,[2] and towards me in every relation,[3] as is fitting. For there is none here in the city or in the women's house, even among thy servants, whom thou dost not gladden by rightful behaviour, thou maiden with faultless limbs. But I thought I must give thee the reminder, O Pṛithā, as regards the wrathful-minded Brahman, thinking : " Thou art a child " and " Thou art my daughter ". Born in the family of the Vṛishṇis, the beloved daughter of Çūra, thou wast given me formerly as a child by thy father himself, bound to me in friendship, O thou sister of Vasudeva, thou the greatest of my children, after he had promised me in the beginning the first-born. Therefore thou art my daughter. Born in such a house, and brought up in such a house, thou hast come from happiness to happiness, as though thou hadst come from out of the sea into the sea.[4] People of bad family, who may somehow have known special favour,[5] do wrong things out of their foolishness, especially women, O sweet one. Pṛithā, birth in a king's family, and wonderful beauty are thine ; with the one and the

[1] Brahmadaṇḍa. This expression is often found in the Epic, and denotes the might of the Brahman (brahman), resting on the holy word of the Veda (brahman); or, the magical, supernatural, destroying might, at work in the curse. See, for example, i, 2.354 ; 30.11 ; 54.23,25 (Nīl. is wrong here, in spite of 57.5) ; 57.24 ; ii, 5.122 ; 68.46 ; v, 51.8 ; viii, 34.43 ; xii, 39.10 ; 103.27 ; xvi, 1.9 ; 3.40 (cp. 4.3 ; 8.8,25 ; Rām. vii, 36.20,30 ; i, 56.19.

[2] Or : mother. " Mothers " is, of course, what all the king's wives are called. She had not her real mother at all at Kuntibhoja's court.

[3] Literally : filling everything, penetrating. Cp. v, 107.15.

[4] Hradād dhradam ivāgatā. Cp. i, 195.11 ; v, 90.91,92 ; 134.14.

[5] According to the commentator and Böhtlingk (in the Dict.) : " fall into stubbornness," which does not at all fit in.

other thou hast been made happy and endowed, O lovely one. If thou shunnest pride, deceit, and haughtiness, and bringest content to the grace-bestowing Brahman, thou wilt link thyself with happiness, O Pṛithā. Thus, thou good one, thou wilt indeed attain to goodness, O blameless one. And if the best of the twice-born is angered, then my whole family will be destroyed."

Kuntī spoke: "I will, O king, honourably serve the Brahman with all heed, according to the promise, O lord of kings, and I speak no untruth. And that is my character, that I honour the Brahmans. And I must do what is dear to thee, and my greatest happiness. Whether the holy one comes at evening or in the early morning or in the night or at midnight, he will arouse no anger in me. It is a gain for me, O lord of kings, to bring salvation to myself, O best of men, through honouring the Brahmans and faithfully carrying out thy bidding. Thou canst have a calm trust, O lord of kings; the best among the twice-born shall suffer nothing unpleasing while he dwells in thy house; that I swear unto thee. What is pleasing to this Brahman and for thy good, O blameless one, for that will I strive, O king. Let the fever in thy soul leave thee. For the Brahmans, they marked out by destiny, can save if they are honoured; and if not, then they can destroy. Since I know this, I shall rejoice the best among Brahmans. Through me, O king, thou wilt suffer no harm from the most excellent of Brahmans. In case of a mistake, O prince of kings, the Brahmans become a destruction to kings, as did Cyavana formerly to King Çaryāti, because of Sukanyā. With the greatest zeal will I serve the Brahman as thou didst say unto the Brahman." While the king clasped her in his arms and exhorted her, as he repeatedly spoke thus, he told her of all that was to be done in this way and that. The king spoke: "Thus must thou do it, without hesitation, dear one, for the sake of my happiness, of thyself, and of the family, O stainless one."

But when Kuntibhoja, the greatly famed, had thus spoken, he gave Pṛithā over to this Brahman, he the friend to Brahmans. "This, O Brahman, is my daughter, a child of tender breeding; if she makes a mistake in any wise thou must not take it to

heart. The Brahmans, they marked out by destiny, never in general harbour anger against the aged, children and the sick who may offend against them. Even when the sin is great the twice-born must show a patient forgiveness. Accept thou the honour shown to the best of her strength and powers, O best among Brahmans." The Brahman agreed, and the king with a glad heart allotted him a house, white as the swan and the shimmering moon. There he offered him at the place of the holy fire a shining seat made ready, food, and the like, and all this just as it should be.[1] But as the king's daughter threw off weariness and likewise pride, she took the utmost pains to please the Brahman. Thither to the Brahman Pṛithā went, thinking only of purity, and rejoiced him, him worthy of service, according to precept like a god. So did the maid living under a strict vow now rejoice with pure soul the Brahman living under a strict vow. Often the best of Brahmans spoke : " I shall come in the morning," and then came back at evening or in the night. And this maid did ever do honour to him at all hours of the day with hard and soft foods and with comforts, which both ever more excelled. The care given him with food and the like, as also that for bed and seat, grew greater, not less, day by day. And even though the Brahman might scold Pṛithā, abuse her, and utter evil words against her, O king, yet she did nothing then to annoy him. He would come back again at different times, or often not at all, and of some dish very hard to get he would say : " Give it me ! " And as she brought him all this to his liking, so soon as it was made, bearing herself well, like a scholar, a son, a sister, she aroused heartfelt approval in the excelling Brahman, she the pearl of maidens, the stainless one. The best of Brahmans was gladdened at her virtuous ways ; then she took the very greatest pains [2] with still greater heed. At morning and evening her father would ask her : " Is the Brahman pleased with thy service,

[1] Tathaiva " just so, most excellently ". Cp. īdṛica, tādṛiç, tathāvidha, tathābhūta " right ; excellent," iii, 221.6,9 ; v, 90.62 ; ix, 2.62.

[2] I will read bhūyasā instead of bhūyo syāḥ. The text would mean more or less : Thereupon he took the very greatest pains in the utmost measure about her.

daughter ? " The glorious one would answer him : " Very much so." At that Kuntibhoja, the high-minded one, felt the greatest joy. When, after a year had gone by, that best of the prayer-mutterers had seen no evil deeds in Pṛithā, he was delighted at her goodwill. Now when his heart had become filled with joy, the Brahman spoke to her : " I am highly rejoiced at thy services, thou dear and fair one ; choose gifts of grace for thyself, O sweet one, such as are hard here on earth for man to win, that so through them thou mayest outshine all women in splendour." Kuntī spoke : " For me all is fulfilled, since thou, O best among the knowers of the Veda, and my father are sweet-minded towards me. What should I do with gifts of grace, O Brahman ? " The Brahman spoke : " If thou, kind, bright-smiling one, wishest for no gifts of grace from me, then take from me these words of magic for calling up the heaven-dwellers. Whatsoever god thou dost call up by this magic spell, he must be obedient to thee ; whether he will or no, he will come up under the spell of thy command ; tamed by the magic, the god will bow to thee like a servant." The blameless one could not then refuse the best of Brahmans a second time, fearing his curse. Thereupon the twice-born one made the maiden with the faultless limbs take the set of words which stands in the Atharvaçiras. But when he had given it her, he spoke unto Kuntibhoja : " I have dwelt pleasantly, O king, satisfied by the maiden, ever well honoured, while I was lodged in thy house. Now I will set forth." With these words he vanished. When the king now saw the Brahman vanish before his very eyes, he was overcome with astonishment, and did honour to Pṛithā.

Now when this best of the twice-born had for some reason or other gone away, this maiden pondered on the power or otherwise of the magic spell : " What kind of spell has been given me then by the high-minded one ? I will learn about its strength in a short while. As she was thus thinking, she happened to notice her monthly flow, and filled with shame was the child, who was having the menses in her girlhood (for the first time).[1] Then she saw, who was used to a splendid couch, the

[1] This shame is to be set down greatly to her credit. For the coming of this event is for the Indian girl a source of pride and rejoicing, like

sun's disk rise, resting in the east on the palace roof. The mind and eyes of the slender one clung to it, and as the sun god was only just rising she was not annoyed by the heat of his body. She was granted the divine sight: she saw the god in his divine manifestation, wearing his armour, adorned with two ear-rings. But she was curious as to her magic spell, and so the fair one called on this god. As she then moistened her senses' tools with water, she called on the maker of day; he came swiftly, honey-yellow, long-armed, muscular-necked, lightly laughing, with rings on his arms, a crown on his head, making the lands of the world, as it were, to blaze up. Splitting his own self by magic into two parts, he came and brightly glowed. Then he spoke to Kuntī, with exceeding kind and friendly words: "I have become of service to thee, bound by thy magic spell, my dear one. What am I to do, as thy vassal, O queen? Speak! I will do it." Kuntī spoke: "Go thither, O sublime one, whence thou camest. It was out of curiosity that I called thee. Be merciful to me, O lord." The sun god spoke: "I will go, even as thou hast bidden me, O slender one. But it is not right to call on a god and send him away for a worthless

the sprouting of the moustache for the youth, and in this she is like he, sisters among very many peoples. As almost everywhere on the earth, the girl on the Ganges from her earliest years knows all about every thing, and with her the coming of puberty excites a lively interest, and is even hailed with much rejoicing. That most delightful thing in the world—the maiden blossoming in sweet ignorance, and the half-painful, half-joyful emotional billowing of her soul, wrapped in holy and pure dream secrets—this, indeed, the Hindu does not know. Still this most delicate, ethereal bloom of European culture is by no means so very common amongst us, and, moreover, in our days under sentence of death under the dazzling beams of the sun of "sexual knowledge"—poor, fairy-tale wonder of the moonlight night. Thus no Hindu maiden could give utterance to such a fragrant delicacy of feeling as we find expressed in the fairest puberty poem in the world in *Neidon valitus*, the "Maiden's Lament", of the Finnish poet Eerikki Ticklén, who died, all too young, in 1827 (cp. J. J. Meyer, *Vom Land der tausend Seen. Eine Abhandlung über die neuere finnische Literatur und eine Auswahl aus modernen finnischen Novellisten* (p. 33). The reader may be here reminded, too, of Peter Hille's wonderful *Brautseele*.

whim. Thy intention is, O lovely one : May I get a son from the sun god, one peerless in heroic strength, clad in armour, decked with ear-rings. Give thyself, then, to me, thou with the elephant's gait ; for a son shall be born thee, such as thou yearnest after, O woman. I will go then, when I have been joined with thee, O thou with the lovely smile. If thou wilt not do as I say, do what is dear to me,[1] then in my anger I shall curse thee, and the Brahman, and thy father. Because of thee I shall beyond a doubt engulf them all with fire, and thy father, moreover, because he gave no heed to thy wrong behaviour. And on that Brahman I shall deal out a hard chastisement for giving thee the magic spell without knowing thy character and ways. For all the gods in heaven there with Indra at their head are witnesses to my having been tricked by thee, and are smiling as it were, O lovely one. Look but at those bands of the gods, for thou hast that divine sight which I first granted thee and whereby thou hast seen me." Then the king's daughter saw all the thirty-three (gods) at their stations in the air, bright as the dazzling, shining, great sun god. When the young maiden, the queen, saw them, she spoke these words, abashed and fearful, to the sun god : " Go, pray, lord of the beams, unto thy heavenly chariot. It was from my maidenly nature that the disastrous mistake arose.[2] Father and mother and any other dignitaries there may be have the power to bestow this body. I will not do hurt to law and virtue ; in the world the safe keeping of the body is held in honour as the virtuous way of woman's life. It was to try the might of the magic spell that I called thee, O shining one. ' From childish want of understanding the child did it,' is what thou mayest think,[3] and forgive me for this, O my lord." The sun god spoke : " Since I think that it is a child, I will utter unto thee friendly words ; no other would get such mild words.

[1] Literally perhaps : " If thou dost not make my dear words true," which would remind us of Homeric expressions, or in which " dear " = pleasant, friendly.

[2] Cp. v, 144.22 ; xv, 30.9.

[3] Tat kṛitvā ; oftener, iti kritvā. i, 34.3 ; 7.17 ; iii, 18.9 ; 208.17 ; 302.4 ; 303.22 ; 306.25 ; iv, 20.3 f. ; xiv, 19.78 ; xv, 9.8 ; evaṃ kṛi, iii, 138.25. See also xii, 318.32.

Give thyself to me, Kuntī girl, and thou wilt find peace, O timid one. And it is not fitting for me that I should go forth as one that has been wrongly treated, without having been united with thee, O timid fair one, after being called up by a spell. I shall fall a victim to laughter in the world, O maiden with faultless limbs, and to all the gods, O lovely one, I should be blameworthy. Unite thyself with me ; thou shalt get a son like unto me ; in all the worlds thou wilt assuredly stand forth."

In spite, however, of her many friendly words, this sensible maiden could not soften the thousand-beamed one. When the young girl could not send off the scarer of darkness, she pondered now for a while, filled with fear of his curse : " How shall it be that the curse of this wrathful sun god may not, because of me, light upon my father and likewise the Brahman ? And he that is young and foolish must not through blindness let fiery strength and the power of penitence, which, indeed, have brought much disaster, come near unto him. For how can I, who am now so tortured, how can I myself boldly take in hand and carry out my bestowal on the man, which does not befit me ? " Dreading the curse, with many wavering thoughts in her heart, gripped in her limbs by a swimming weakness, smiling ever and again, and filled with anxiety for her kindred, the curse-afeared one spoke to the god in a voice quivering with shame : " My father is alive, O god, and my mother and my other kinsfolk. So long as they still live let not the holy precept be thus broken. If the unlawful union with thee should come about, O god, then the good name of my family in the world would come to nought because of me. But if thou holdest this to be right and virtuous, O best of the shining ones, without the bestowal by my kindred, then I will fulfil thy wish. But if I have given myself up to thee, O thou so hard to overcome, then I am an unchaste woman. In thee abides the right, the splendour, and the good name of mankind." The sun god spoke : " Neither father, mother, nor dignitaries have any power in this,[1] O thou with the bright smile and fair hips.

[1] Literally : The father has not the disposal of thee, the mother has not the disposal of thee, nor, etc. Or perhaps less well : Not thy father, not thy mother, nor the dignitaries have power (the disposal).

Be pleased to hear my words. Since she covets all, and is from the root " to covet ", O lovely one, therefore (she) is the " maiden ", the fair-hipped, (and she stands) alone, O lovely-faced one.[1] Thou wilt have done no wrong whatever, fair one. How could I in my love for the world choose a wrong deed ! All women and men are without restraint, O lovely-faced one. This is the real nature of mankind, any other is to speak untruly, as the holy tradition teaches. After union with me thou wilt again be a virgin, and thy son will become strong-armed and greatly famed." Kuntī spoke : " If a son shall come to me from thee, thou scatterer of all darkness, who is decked with ear-rings, clad in armour, a hero, strong-armed and very mighty. . . ."[2] The sun god spoke : " He will be strong-armed and decked with ear-rings, and wear divine armour. And both, O kind one, will be made for him from the Immortal."[3] Kuntī spoke : " If that is of the Immortal—the two ear-rings, and the splendid harness of my son, whom thou wouldst beget with me—then let my union with thee, O sublime god, come about, as thou hast said. And may he be endowed with thy hero's strength, thy form, bravery, and power, and with virtue." The sun god spoke : " Aditi, O queen, has given me ear-rings, thou that art as one drunk ; them I will give him, O timid one, and this most excelling armour." Kuntī spoke : " That is well indeed. I will unite myself with thee, if my son shall be as thou sayest, O lord of the beams." " Good," answered the sky-wanderer, Svarbhānu's foe, joined himself with Kuntī, taking on a magic body, and touched her on the navel. Thereupon the maid swooned, as it were, through

K. (308.12) reads more smoothly pradāne te instead of varārohe. Cf. Mārkaṇḍeyapur., cxiii, 14 : In all things one shall listen to the Gurus (dignitaries), but in love they have nothing to say.

[1] Kanyā (maiden, virgin), that is to say, is held to come from kam to covet.

[2] K. has destroyed the beauty of this unfinished sentence by a third çloka line : astu me saṃgamo, deva, anena samayena te.

[3] That is, they are themselves indestructible, and bestow immunity on their wearer ; death, too, has no power over him (iii, 300.17–20). Cp. i, 330.10 ff. ; iii, 310.10 ff. ; 301.17. As is well known, the world's literature, particularly the Indian, shows very many such magic things.

the fiery strength and majesty of the sun god, and she, the queen, now fell with confused mind on to the couch. The sun god spoke : " I shall bring it about : thou wilt bear a son who is the first among all that bear arms, and thou wilt be a virgin." Then spoke the young woman, filled with shame, to the sun god, the many-beamed, as he proceeded : " So let it be." [1] When the daughter of the king of the Kunti thus had spoken, prayerful and ashamed, to the sun god, she fell onto that pure couch, overcome in a swoon, like a broken tendril. He of the sharp beams bewildered her with his fiery strength, united with her through his magic power, and made her his own ; and the sun god did not dishonour her.[2] And then the young woman got back her senses again.

Then the fruit of Pṛithā's body came into being, on the eleventh day of the bright half of the moon, as in heaven did the ruler of the stars. For fear of her kinsfolk the young woman kept this child secret, she, the lovely-hipped one,

[1] My translation of sādhayishyāmi and prasthita is quite a possible one, and it was chosen so as to make the tale in some measure consistent with itself. But the natural reading would be : " I will now go off, thou wilt, etc. Then spoke the young woman . . . as he went off, etc." In the following there is a change from the çloka into the trishṭubh ; it is evidently a piece from another account which was inserted without the joins being properly filled in—a constant practice in the MBh. The çloka and the first version is taken up again with : " Then Pṛithā conceived a fruit of her body." Were it not for çl. 125, the two trishṭubh could naturally be easily taken as a concluding summary ; *with* that çloka this is difficult, if we take sādhayishyāmi and prasthita in the usual meaning. There is probably, too, an unskilful join made in the tale in so far as the sun god " touches (the woman) on the navel ", after the way of ascetics who do not want to harm their chastity and yet to help in bringing a son into being (e.g. Jātaka, Nos. 497 and 540 ; Windisch, *Buddhas Geburt*, etc., p. 20 ff. ; Reitzenstein, *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.*, Bd. 41, p. 648). Of course, divyena vidhinā in 308.13 seems to point to exactly such a begetting—which allusion, however, may be secondary—and impregnation through the touch of the hand, is often found in India and elsewhere (e.g. i, 104.51 f.).

[2] Did not destroy her maidenhead, or restored it again after union. P. 33, line 9, instead of " still be a virgin ", perhaps : " be a virgin again."

and folk noticed nothing about her. For no other woman knew of it but her nurse's daughter, a young girl in the city, who well understood how to shield her. Later in due time the lovely-faced one brought forth her child, and as an unharmed virgin through the favour of that god: like an immortal, wearing armour and shining ear-rings of gold, yellow-eyed, bull-shouldered, just as his father. And so soon as the lovely one had borne this child, she took counsel with the nurse, and laid it in a chest that was well lined all round, waxed over, soft and easy, and well fastened; and weeping, she set the child forth thus in the river Açva. Though she knew that a maid must bear no fruit of her body, yet she wailed bitterly out of love for her little son. The words spoken in tears then by Kuntī, as she set him forth in the chest in the river's waters—hear them: "Good come to thee from the beings in the air and the earth and in the sky and those in the water, my little son! Blessed be thy paths! May the waylayers keep far from thee! And even so may they that have come hither along the road (āgata) be friendly-hearted towards thee! May King Varuṇa, the prince of the waters, watch over thee in the water, and in the air the god of the wind, who is in the air, and goeth everywhere. May thy father ward thee everywhere, the shining one and best of the shining ones, who has given me thee, O son, in divine wise. May the Ādityas, Vasus, Rudras, Sādhyas, and the All-gods, the Maruts together with Indra, and the quarters of the world with the wardens thereof watch over thee, may all the gods watch over thee on smooth and on rugged paths! I shall know thee, too, abroad, for the armour betrays thee. Happy, my son, is thy father, the blazing sun god, who sees thee in the river with his god's eye. Happy the woman who shall take thee for son, O son, and whose breast thou shalt thirstily suck, thou god-begotten one! What (happiness-bringing) dream she indeed had who makes thee to be her son, thee blazing like the sun, endowed with heavenly armour, decked with heavenly ear-rings, thee that hast long white lotus-eyes, that shinest like a red lotus-leaf,[1] that hast a lovely

[1] Literally: shining like the red leaf of the lotus. We should expect something like padmatāmradalaushṭhakam, "with lips like a

forehead and lovely hair. It is happy folk that will see thee, my son, a little crawler about the earth and, covered in dust, babbling darling words. Happy folk will see thee then, my son, come into the years of youth, like the maned lion born in the Himālaya forest." Pṛithā having thus bitterly lamented in various wise, now set forth the chest on the waters of the Açva river. Weeping, tortured with sorrow for her son, and filled with the yearning to see him, then Pṛithā, the lotus-eyed, in the middle of the night together with her nurse, again came into the king's palace, sick with sorrow, after having had the box sent drifting away through fear lest her father should come to know of the thing. But the chest swam from the Açva river into the river Carmaṇvatī, from the Carmaṇvatī into the Yamunā, and from there into the Gaṅgā. On the Gaṅgā the child in the chest came into the territory of the chariot-driver, to the city of Campā, as the little one was carried along by the waves.[1]

red lotus leaf." But the red hue of the new-born is also referred to elsewhere in the MBh.

[1] There he is found by Adhiratha, the chariot-driver of Dhṛitarāshṭra, who takes him to himself as child, and brings him up. The same tale is told earlier, i, 67.129 ff., and shorter i, 111. According to the former, and according to i, 122.35–37, Durvāsas says from the beginning that the purpose of the magic is that Kuntī may get a son from any god she may call up; and we have not to do, as we clearly have in our account, with a begetting without the virginity being destroyed; but we find: "And the god of the brightest splendour gave her back her maidenhead" (i, 111.20). With this xv, 30.16 also agrees. The Brahman of this account was called Durvāsas.

With the motive of the exposed Perseus or Cyrus or of "Moses in the bulrushes" (in his case smeared over with clay and pitch, 2 Moses, ii, verse 3) and of Kuntī, the maiden-mother, compare how in the Shahnameh Darab is exposed by his mother Humāi on the Euphrates in a precious small chest directly after his birth, and is found and adopted by washer-folk; Jātaka, v, p. 429; Chauvin, vii, 97; Hertel, Hemacandra's Pariçishṭaparvan, ii, 238, and his references, p. 228, as also ZDMG (*Zeitsch. d. deutsch. morgenl. Ges.*), Bd. 65, p. 438 f.; H. Schurtz, *Urgeschichte der Kultur* (1900), p. 578; "The Wicked Stepmother" in *Aino Tales*, by Basil Hall Chamberlain, privately printed for the Folk Lore Society, xxii, p. 48; and above all Frobenius,

With this, however, the sorrow that was to light upon the king's daughter from this child Karṇa had only begun. Karṇa becomes, indeed, the friend and faithful comrade of Duryodhana, the fierce foe of her later children, the Pāṇḍavas, and in the desperate fight that breaks out between these and the Kauravas he fights with overwhelming and crushing heroic might against his brothers, especially against his rival Arjuna. When the young Pāṇḍavas have served their full time, their teacher Droṇa makes them show their skill before a splendid festal gathering. Arjuna stands out before all the others. Then a wonderful hero comes onto the arena, Karṇa, and does

Zeitalter des Sonnengottes, Bd. i, p. 223 ff.; and P. Saintyves, *Les vierges mères et les naissances miraculeuses* (Paris, 1908). The two last-named works are, I am sorry to say, not to my hand, and I know them only from reviews. Supernatural fertilization has been very thoroughly treated by E. S. Hartland, *Legend of Perseus*, vol. i, and then in the earlier chapters of his careful and luminous book, *Primitive Paternity* (1909). As is well known, girls at the coming of puberty or of the first monthly course must among the most various peoples and tribes of the earth be carefully looked after, generally even shut up for a shorter or longer time, and especially kept from the sun; and it is quite an astonishment when we are told by C. G. and Brenda Z. Seligmann, *The Veddas* (Cambridge, 1911), p. 94, that this people, both on this and remarkably so on many other points (cp. for instance, p. 190 f.), has no superstitions, except where it has lost some of its primitiveness through contact with foreigners. The girl is at this very time highly susceptible to magical influences, and easily brings ill-hap on others. It is particularly by the sun or its beams that women in general and above all at the first monthly course can be impregnated. See Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1900), iii, p. 204 ff., especially 219 and 222, and the evidence there; Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, i, 25 f., 89 ff., 97 ff.; *Anthropos*, Bd. vi, p. 699; Bd. vii, p. 93; Crooke, *Popular Religion and Folk-Lore of Northern India*, new ed., i, 11, 69, and the references there; Reitzenstein, *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.*, 1909, p. 658 f.; R. Schmidt, *Liebe u. Ehe in Indien*, p. 477. With Kunti's swoon, cf. the Maidu Indian tale of Oankoitupeh, the red cloud's son, Hartland, loc. cit., i, 195 f. A Rājput tale often reminding us of the MBh. tale is given by Tod, *Rajasthan*, i, 251–52; and that the Rājput should thus trace the origin of one of their kings to the sun seems the more natural in that it is their highest god (Tod, *Rajasthan*, i, 596 ff., 250).

all the feats which Arjuna had just been the only one to do ; and when Arjuna flies into a rage, the unwelcome new-comer calmly challenges him to a duel with bow and arrow. The whole gathering, however, is very deeply roused. "The audience split into two, among the women two parties were formed ; but Kuntibhoja's daughter swooned away, when she saw what was happening. As Kuntī thus lay in a swoon, Vidura, the knower of all duties, brought her to herself again through the servant-maids with sandal-water. When her life-spirits had now come back again, and she saw her two sons equipped for the fray, she was utterly bewildered, and knew not what to do." [1] She has then to see how the noble splendid Karṇa is put to shame, first because of the darkness of his origin, then because of his supposed father, Adhiratha, the chariot-driver (i, 136 f.).

Here the party of the Pāṇḍavas wins the victory ; from fear lest Arjuna, their pride, should be overcome by Karṇa, they trick Karṇa shamefully. But afterwards it would be a gift of heaven beyond price for the Pāṇḍavas, if they could win him. Kuntī herself then takes the step that is so painful for her : she goes to Karṇa, just when he is carrying out his worship of the sun god at the river's shore, waits humbly in the burning glow till he is done, and then discloses to him that he is not the chariot-driver's son, but her sun-god-begotten virgin-child, and strives to unite him with his brothers. But the mighty one first remonstrates with her for having treated him before in so unmotherly wise, and having ruthlessly deprived him of the warrior's sacraments and the career laid down for him, while now she was seeking him out for her own ends. He declares both the words of his mother and the voice that comes solemnly from the sun, confirming and supporting what she had said, to be false. Then in a speech showing the inborn nobility of the soul of this the finest hero in all Indian literature he makes known his resolve to stay faithful until death to his lords and friends the Kauravas,

[1] Or : she was at a loss (na kiṃcit pratyapadyata). See vi, 119.111,115 ; 120.16. Böhtlingk wrongly has : "kept calm" (but so it probably is in v, 73.20 ; vii, 134.24).

although for him it were better otherwise.[1] But to the mother, filled with care about her other sons, he gives the great-hearted promise to spare them all in the fight; only with Arjuna will he fight a life and death struggle. Thus did Karṇa lose her for ever (v, 144 ff.; cp. xii, 1.18 ff.; 6.9 ff.).

Many years after the bloody battles, when the sun's great son has long been slain through low cunning, Kuntī is still being irked by the memory of her youthful sin, for which fate is punishing her so heavily, and to which she had been led, setting aside a forgivable maiden curiosity, mainly by her loving thought for her father and the holy Brahman. She gives a short tale of what happened to her then with the sun god, and declares: "Although I knew my son, yet in my blindness I left him unnoticed. This is burning me." The holy Vyāsa, however, consoles her: "Thou didst do no sin, and didst become a maid again.[2] And the gods of a truth have dominion in their hands; men's virtue is not brought to shame [3] by the virtue of the gods. All for the strong is wholesome, for the strong all is pure, all for the strong is rightful and virtuous, all belongs to the strong" (xv, 30; cp. Kuntī's lament for Karṇa, xv, 16.11 ff.; also xi, 27.6 ff.).

Satyavatī, the mother of the famous Vyāsa, held to be the compiler of the Vedas and author of the Mahābhārata, offers less resistance than the maidenly Kuntī. She had come into

[1] Karṇa knows that the Pāṇḍavas will win, but withal he has already refused Krishṇa, who has enlightened him as to his origin and tried to win him, by the most splendid promises, over to the Pāṇḍavas (v, 140). The great-souled hero answered him that his foster-father and foster-mother had done everything for him, that he loved them, and must bring them the ancestral offering, and so cannot but be true to the Kauravas (v, 141).

[2] Hardly: "Thou hadst then become a maid," and so hadst a right to sexual mating. That would indeed agree with the Brahmanic teaching, that she should have been wedded before, but not at all with the customs of the Epic. Probably still less: "Thou hadst fallen a victim to thy maiden nature," didst only act through want of understanding.

[3] Or: "harmed." The maiden's virtue, chastity, has not suffered, although here the god's righteousness and virtue, his generative hero nature, not bound by men's laws, came into strife with her. According to v, 141.3, the sun god bade Kuntī expose Karṇa.

being in the belly of a fish in an extraordinary way, to be referred to later, and had come out when the creature, really a bewitched Apsaras, had been cut open. She was given by her maker to a fisherman, and was wondrous fair ; only she had a fish-like smell. Her foster-father had a ferry-boat over the Yamunā, and she took over its working for him. Then there came one day the Ṛishi or holy man Parāçara to be ferried over. He at once fell in love with the lovely-thighed one, and without waiting made her his proposal : " Be joined with me, lovely one ! " She spoke : " See, O holy man, the Ṛishis are standing on the other shore. How could we unite while they see us ? " Thus addressed by her, the holy and glorious, the mighty one, brought about a mist by which that whole neighbourhood was changed, as it were, into one stretch of darkness. But when she now saw this mist, made by the excelling Ṛishis, the maiden was greatly astonished and ashamed, poor girl. Satyavatī spoke : " Know, O holy man, that I am a maid, and still subject to my father. Through a union with thee my maidenhead would be lost, O blameless one. And if my maidenhead is harmed, how shall I be able, O Ṛishi, best of the twice-born, to go home ? I cannot then live, O wise man. Think over this, O glorious one, and then do what lies next to hand." To her thus speaking, said the best of the Ṛishis, filled with joy and love : " When thou hast done me this favour, then shalt thou become a maid again.[1] And choose thyself, thou fearful one, a favour thou wouldst have, O fair one. For never up to now has my goodwill been without result, thou with the bright smile." Thus spoken to, she chose the loveliest sweet scent in her limbs, and the holy man gave her what she yearned for above all. After she had won the favour, filled with joy, and decked with the greatest gift of woman (a sweet smell), she united herself with the wonder-working Ṛishi. Hence her name Gandhavatī (the fragrant one) came to be renowned on earth. The scent of her was smelt by men here below a Yojana (" mile ") away. Therefore her other name is Yojanagandhā. Thus was Satyavatī joyful, having received the incomparable favour, and united

[1] Or less likely : " still be wholly a maid " (kanyaiva tvaṃ bhavishyasi).

herself with Parāçara and bore at once the fruit of her body" (i, 63.67 ff.). Satyavatī herself tells this tale shorter (i, 105.5 ff.) There she says that the fear, too, of the holy man's curse, not only this gracious gift, had influenced her, and that the Ṛishi enjoyed her in the boat, and bade her expose the child on an island in the river; and that thereupon she had become a maid again.

This wondrous keeping or restoring of maidenhead is often found elsewhere in the Mahābhārata. The tale of the princess Mādhavī reminds us of one of Boccaccio's novels. There was a pious disciple of Viçvāmitra, by name Gālava, who after serving long was dismissed by his teacher. He insisted on paying the holy man the teacher's fee, so that he (the teacher) at last grew angry, and named him as the price eight-hundred noble, moon-white steeds, each with one black ear. At length the desperate, vainly-seeking Gālava comes to King Yayāti. He, indeed, cannot fulfil his request for these rare beasts, either, but in fear of the dreadful results of refusing a suppliant he gives him his young daughter Mādhavī, whom for her loveliness even gods and spirits desire, and lets him know that kings would give him as the price of her a whole kingdom, not to speak of eight hundred such black-eared horses; the only condition he would make for himself is that her sons may make the ancestral sacrifice for him. First of all Gālava goes with the fascinating beauty to King Haryaçva, who sees by the build of her body that she, who is a sight for the heavenly ones themselves, can give life to many sons, and even to a world-ruler. But when the love-sick one hears of the extraordinary price to be paid, he sighs sorrowfully, and acknowledges he can give only two hundred such horses. For these Gālava shall let him beget but one son with her. In this strait Mādhavī now tells him: "I was granted a grace by a man learned in the Veda: 'After each birth thou wilt become a maid again.' Give me to the king, so soon as thou hast received two hundred peerless steeds. By means of four kings thou wilt thus get my full eight hundred horses, and I shall get four sons." So then Gālava gives Haryaçva the maiden for a fourth of the price, that he may live with her till she has borne him a son. After this happy event has come

about he then goes with Mādhavī, who by the power of her wish has become a maid again, to King Divodāsa, who has already heard of the famous beauty and her story and rejoices greatly. He, too, can only give two hundred such animals, and is allowed to beget one son with her. The next visit of the two is to King Uçīnara ; he gives his two hundred horses and with the glorious one he lives a life of joy in mountain grottoes and by river waterfalls, in gardens, groves, and forests, in lovely palaces and on castle-towers, in windowed imperial abodes and bedchambers, till, after the birth of a son, Gālava comes and demands the woman back again from him. The bird king Garuḍa now tells the owner of the six hundred wonderful steeds that there are no more on this earth, for originally there were only a thousand, and the other four hundred have been carried away by the river Vitastā, as they were trying to get them across. He is to offer the lovely one, he tells him, to his teacher for two hundred such steeds. Thus it is, and Viçvāmitra, who is, indeed, a judge of woman's charms, is at once satisfied, and even exclaims : " Why didst thou not at once give me her here at the beginning ? Then I should have got four sons from her to carry on the line." She bears him a son, and later he withdraws into the forest as an ascetic, giving her up to his disciple Gālava, who brings her back to her father. Her father now wishes to hold a great choosing of a husband, but she takes to a life in the forest and becomes a distinguished penitent (v, 114 ff.).[1]

Draupadī, too, the leading heroine of the Mahābhārata, after union still bears the flower of her maidenhood unplucked. She is wedded to the five Pāṇḍavas one after the other, and we hear : " In this wise the king's five sons, the splendid chariot-fighters, the gloriously-made, continuers of the Kaurava race, then took the splendid woman by the hand, each one on his day. And this miracle surpassing all that is human is proclaimed by the divine Ṛishi : the lovely one with the glorious waist, the very mighty one, at the end of each day became a maid again "[2] (i, 198.11 ff.). The Ṛishi is Vyāsa, himself the child of a *semper virgo*, as has already been said.

[1] Cf. Crooke, *Popular Religion and Folk-Lore, etc.*, ii, 204.

[2] Or : was still a maid (babhūva kanyaiva).

Here, however, we must so understand it that Draupadī gets back (or, keeps) her maidenhead, only four times, that she may fall into the arms of each of the five brothers as untouched. For the maidenhead is, as in Old India in general, set very high in the Epic likewise.[1] xiii, 36.17, states :

[1] What is, perhaps, very generally known from the novel *Nena Sahib*, by Sir John Ratcliffe (a Berlin writer whose real name I cannot now with certainty call to mind) is borne witness to by the *Centuries* of Hāla for older times, too ; there the ānaṃdavaḍa, " the cloth (garment) of bliss " is publicly shown with rejoicings on the morning following the bridal night ; though in this case it is not dyed with " the shed blood of innocence ", for a young rascal goes by it and slily grins to himself (No. 457). Particularly rich in information here is Kauṭilya. See my translation (Leipzig, 1926), p. 357.6 ff. ; 35 ff. The little tricks of the ladies, of which Brantôme can tell us, were, then, already known in Old India. He tells us that down to his time in Spain after the *depucellement* of brides their *linge teint de gouttes de sang* was publicly shown through the window, with loud cries of : Virgen la tenemos, and that there was a like custom in Viterbo. Then he entertains us with an account of how those daughters of Eve, who have already nibbled from the tree of knowledge, supply what is lacking by art, and with a merry tale of one who quite fruitlessly made use of the red juice she had so carefully brought with her, and fruitlessly for the same reason that Iseult White-hand fortifies herself so strongly to no purpose against the storming of her treasury of love (Heinrich von Freiberg, *Tristan*, 698 ff.). See Brantôme, *Œuvres compl.* ed. du Panthéon lit. vol. ii, pp. 242 b, 332 b. Among the Yurakara in South America, the smock of the bridal night was carried round in triumph (Mantegazza, *Geschlechtsverhältnisse*, p. 253). The Arabs, too, publicly show the stained bed-clothes (*Anthropos*, iii, p. 184 f.). So, too, among the South Slavs, the bed-linen and the bride's smock are or were searched for the signs of maidenhead, and the happy find was hailed with joy (Krauss, *Sitte und Brauch der Südslaven*, pp. 225, 461 f.). Quite the same thing happens among the Russians and other Slavs (*Zeits. d. Ver. f. Volkskunde*, Bd. 15, p. 438 f.), as also among the Turks in Bulgaria (ibid., Bd. 4, p. 272). Among the Fô in Togo the man sends the bedding next morning to the mother-in-law, and if this is not marked as it should be, the parents have to find out the evil-doer (*Anthropos*, vii, 296). Cf. 5 Moses, xxii, verses 15–17 ; and further Ploss-Bartels, *Das Weib*[4], i, pp. 365 ff. ; my transl. of Kauṭilya, 358.27 ff.

"Conceit destroys the happiness of a man of shallow understanding, it is by a pregnancy that the maiden is robbed of honour,[1] and through dwelling and staying in the house the Brahman." And according to vii, 73.17, the man who enjoys a woman that has already been enjoyed by another belongs to the abominable whose lot in the world beyond is a dreadful one. However, what is in mind here, at least in the first place, is a girl that has lost her maidenhead and is taken to wife. But all the shame and guilt does not fall withal, as it does in almost all lands, on her that has strayed, but we are told: "A third of the murder of a Brahman (that is, of the most heinous of all crimes) is what the sinning virgin (kanyā dushyatī) takes on herself; but he that brings shame on her takes two thirds" (xii, 165.42, 34).[2] The heedless giving of

[1] Or: ruined (dushyate).

[2] The law books deal just as sternly with the maidenhood of the girl. Only the unsullied one can receive the woman's consecration, the regular wedding. Manu, viii, 226; ix, 176. It is only her son that takes his father's caste. Manu, x, 5; Āpastamba, ii, 6, 13.1 ff. A man is only to wed a maiden that as yet has had nothing to do with a man. Vasishṭha, viii, 1; Gautama, iv, 1, etc. The bride's failings must, according to the law writings, be faithfully made known before she is given away, and, besides certain bodily faults, among these is the loss of maidenhead. Nārada, xii, 36, etc. Anyone making a false accusation against a maid of breaking her chastity must pay 100 paṇa. Manu, viii, 225; Yājñavalkya, i, 66; Nārada, xii, 34; but according to Vishṇu, v, 47, the highest possible money atonement (uttama sāhasa). Cf. my transl. of Kauṭilya, 357.12 ff.; addit. 357.12–15. Defloration and intercourse with a girl is heavily punished. In that case the evil-doer's property shall be confiscated, and he banished; while the king must then see to it that sinful maidens such as these shall be saved and kept from going wrong. This is the teaching of Āpastamba, ii, 10, 26.21–24. Manu, viii, 368, lays it down: He that dishonours a maid shall pay 200 paṇa, if it was done with her will. According to Nārada, xii, 71–72, that is not an offence; but the man must honourably wed the girl. Yājñavalkya, ii, 288, holds that if the girl belongs to a lower caste than the man, then it is not an offence, a view which others do not share. If a man lie with a maid against her will, or with one of a higher caste, then there are very stern laws, of which later. Indeed, union with a maiden is the same as incest or a wrongful act with the teacher's wife, that is it is the most heinous thing there is.

herself to the man by the virtuous maid, which we find so often in the tales of other peoples, especially the Europeans, and later in India likewise, which indeed in many literatures is found as something quite a matter of course, is a thing unknown in the Epic. Devayānī's view in i, 83.1–8 is a monstrosity of Brahman arrogance. True, one might be inclined to apply the words: "My yoke is sweet and my burden is light," to the Gandharva marriage, with which in the Epic even the noble, though untried and innocent Çakuntalā contents himself. But, for the consciousness of the Epic, this form is lawful and blameless and the woman at least treats it as holy and binding, whether the man would like to override it or not.

But in spite of the delightful, shy maids, if not always very hard to win, that are set before us in the Epic, we get the decided impression now and again that here too the woman in love takes the first step, as in general we may hold it to be the mark of Eastern narrative literature.[1] Thus in the Mahābhārata we meet with more than one of these aggressive young women, spiritually akin to the already introduced Devayānī.

When a maiden, threatened by a ravisher, weeping aloud, calls out she wants a husband (iii, 223, 6 ff.), that can be understood. On the other hand, iii, 224.30 ff. does not agree so well with the ordinary rules of womanly reserve; here we find a reversal, as it were, of the tale of Amphitryon, which is met with in so many variations.

Yājñav., iii, 231; Manu, xi, 58 (milder, 62 ff.; in 58 perhaps kumārishv antyajāsu to be taken together). The Mahānirvāṇatantra also agrees with this, and says that the sinner must have his member cut off. Agnipurāṇa, 173, strophe 50b–51, lays it down that such a sinner must leave life behind him; it is on the same level with incest. And so on with other examples. That girls should come to be mothers is a thing that can only happen in the age of Kali. Nārada, i, 31. And the deflowering of maids is one of the horrors that spread around under a bad king. MBh., xii, 90.39.

[1] Manu, viii, 365, lays it down, too, expressly: A maiden that enjoys (bhajantī) a man of high caste goes unpunished: but if she has a love affair (sevamānā) with one of lower caste (jaghanya), she is to be shut up in her house (till she comes to her senses).

The seven Ṛishis by the might of their spell called down Agni from the sun to their sacrifice, that he might take it to the gods. He saw there the wives of the holy men, all seven like wondrous stars to behold. He fell hotly in love with them, but reproached himself for his own foolish passion, for these faithful, pure women would, indeed, not give him any hearing. So he went into the Gārhapatya, one of the three holy fires, and from there let his eyes have their fill of the beloved ones. Burnt up in the glow of his passion, he resolved, however, in the end to die, and went into the forest. Now Svāhā, the daughter of the god Daksha, and in love with him, had already sought for an opportunity (chidra) to be with him. As he was thus so unhappily in love, she had now an opening offered her: "I who am tortured by love will take on the form of the seven wives of the Ṛishis, and give my love to the fire god who is blinded by their loveliness. Thus will he get joy, and I shall have my wish fulfilled." She took, therefore, first the shape of Çivā, the wife of Aṅgiras, came to Agni and spoke: "Agni, love me, who am scorched with love. If thou dost not do this, then know that I shall die. I am Çivā, the wife of Angiras, and am come, sent by the others after we have come to a resolve." Agni spoke: "How knowest thou that I am tortured with love, and how do the others know it, all the beloved wives of the Ṛishis of whom thou hast spoken?" Çivā spoke: "We have always loved thee, but were afraid of thee. Now that we have come to know thy thoughts from thy gestures, I have been sent to thee and have come hither to lie with thee. Carry out the wish speedily that stands before its fulfilment. The women are waiting for me; I must be away, O devourer of sacrifices." Thereupon Agni, filled with the joy of love, lay with this Çivā, and the goddess, joined with him in love, caught up the seed with her hand. Thought she: "Whoever sees me here in this shape in the forest will make a false accusation against the Brahmans' wives because of the fire god. Therefore I will prevent that, and change myself into a Garuḍī.[1] Thus I can leave the forest at my ease." Thereupon she

[1] Garuḍa, mythological huge bird (roc, simurg, griffin, etc.; cp. Chauvin, vii, 10–14; 175); also called Suparṇa.

became a Suparṇī, and came out of the great forest. She saw the mountain Çveta, which is covered with a cane-thicket, and is watched over by wonderful seven-headed snakes with a poisonous glance, by Rākshasas and Piçācas, and by dread bands of ghosts, and filled with women Rākshasas, and many forest beasts and birds. Thither hurried the fair one, onto the mountain-top, hardly to be climbed, and threw the seed into a golden vessel (or, a golden fire-pit). Thus she took on, one after the other, the shape of six of the women beloved by Agni, and made love with him. But she could not take on herself [1] the shape of the seventh, of Arundhatī, because of the penitential might and obedience to her husband of this ideal wife. Each time she added the seed to what was already there, and from it there then arose in consequence a six-headed being, the war god Skanda.

A tale, now, which is in many ways remarkable is that of Gaṅgā and her son : Bhīshma's birth, which is told in i, 96 ff. It belongs to the very numerous set of tales of a supernatural being from whom the favoured man or woman must not ask or seek to find out ; and the best-known of this set of tales is perhaps, besides the Lohengrin saga, the tale of Amor and Psyche, which reaches back to Rigveda times as the myth of Purūravas and Urvaçī.

The king Mahābhisha has won heaven through his piety. One day he is in a gathering of the gods by Brahma. The wind blows up the garment of the river goddess Gaṅgā. The gods quickly cast down their eyes. But Mahābhisha, without thinking, looks. Brahma takes this very ill of him, and utters the curse against him : "Thou wilt be born among the mortals, but then once again come into the world of heaven. This Gaṅgā, who did take thy senses, O fool, will do thee something not to thy liking in the world of men, and when the tide of thy displeasure thereat rises high, thou wilt be set free from thy curse." Now the eight Vasus have just sinned against the holy Vasishṭha : The wife of one of them had longed for Vasishṭha's well-known wonder-cow, because she wanted to make a woman-friend she had among mankind

[1] Cf. my translation of Dāmodaragupta's Kuṭṭanīmatam, p. 30, n. 4.

free of sickness and ever young through the milk of this divine beast. Egged on by her husband, the henpecked Dyaus, the eight all took a share in carrying off the wonder-cow. Vasishṭha uttered the curse on them all to be conceived in a womb, but changed the curse in such wise that they could be freed from it within a year, excepting only the actual sinner, who had to live long on the earth. Now they do not wish to be born of earthly women, and beg Gaṅgā to become their mother, and throw them directly after birth into the water, so that they may be speedily cleansed of their sin.

Gaṅgā consents, and appears before the king Pratīpa, who is given up to good works in Gaṅgādvāra, in sense-ensnaring loveliness; she seats herself without more ado on his right thigh. He asked her what he could do for her, and she said: "I want thee; do thou love me, who love thee. For to repulse women in love is a thing condemned by the good." Pratīpa spoke: "I approach in love no strange woman, nor one that is not of my caste." She made it clear to him that with her he could unite. But he said: "Now thou hast brought on thyself the loss of the boon thou art urging me to grant. And were I to do otherwise, the breaking of the law would bring down destruction on me. Thou hast clasped me by seating thyself on my right thigh. Know thou that this is the seat of children and daughters-in-law. For the left thigh is what the loving woman must make use of, and it thou hast avoided. Therefore will I not make love with thee. Be thou my daughter-in-law, fair-hipped one; I choose thee for my son." The goddess consented, but made the condition: "Whatever I may do, thy son must never make protest." The king promised her this, and the childless man now together with his wife carried out ascetic practices to get a son. And he, the son, then came, and when he was grown up, Pratīpa gave the kingdom over to him, and went into the forest, having told him that a woman from heaven in love with him would come to him; he was to live in love with her, but must not ask after her origin, nor ever make question, whatever she should do.

Now Çāntanu, the son, was, as the Old Indian kings so

often were, a mighty hunter. "So he would go alone along the strand of the Gaṅgā, the resort of the ghostly bands of the Siddhas and Cāraṅas. There one day he saw a splendid woman, shining with beauty like another Lakshmī, quite without blemish, with lovely teeth, divinely adorned, clad in a thin garment, alone, shining like a lotus-flower cup. When he saw her, the hair on his body bristled, and he marvelled at the perfection of her body. With his eyes the king seemed to drink her in, and yet his thirst was not stilled. And the fair one, too, when she saw the brightly shining king walking there, could not get her fill of gazing at him, gripped by the spell of love. Then the king spoke to her, uttering friendly words to her in a soft voice: "Art thou a goddess or a Dānavī, a wife of the Gandharvas or an Apsaras, a Yaksha woman or a snake fairy, or a woman belonging to the human race, O thou with the lovely waist? I beseech thee, that art as a child of the gods, become my wife, thou shining one." She consented, but added: "Whatever I may do, be it good or not good, thou must not hinder me, nor utter anything unkind to me. If thou so behave, then will I dwell with thee, O lord of the earth; but if I am hindered, or anything unkind is uttered to me, then surely shall I leave thee." When he spoke yes unto her, and she had won this best of the lords of earth, she found incomparable joy. And when Çāntanu had won her, he took his joy of her, being obedient to her out of love; "she must not be questioned," so he thought to himself, and spoke nothing to her. In her virtuous ways and the surpassing nobleness of her form, and her hidden services [1] the ruler of the earth found his joy. For of a heavenly form was this goddess Gaṅgā, the wanderer on the three paths, since she, the lovely-faced one, had taken on a glorious human body. And dutifully obedient to her husband lived the wife of Çāntanu, the lion king, granted his wish by fate, whose

[1] Upacāra, service with an erotic meaning is not seldom found in the MBh. (cp. the waiting-maid's expression: "I must first wait on a gentleman"). See, for instance, i, 98.7, 106.25; iii, 295.21; xii, 325.35. So, too, Çiçup., v, 27, and elsewhere. Possible, but perhaps less likely, is: In her virtuous ways, and the surprising nobleness of her form.

splendour was like that of the king of the gods. With her love-firing skill in the joyous union, and in tender love,[1] which held the senses fettered by amorous wiles and dances, she so delighted the king that he found the utmoſt delight. So wrapped was the king in the pleasures of love, and so carried away was he by the surpassing gifts of the glorious woman, that he did not mark how many years, seasons, and months were going by. The prince of men, thus partaking with her of the joys of love to his heart's content, begat with her eight god-like sons. And each son she threw after birth into the water, sank him in the Gaṅgā ſtream, as she spoke : " I give thee joy." Now this the king Çāntanu did not like, but the lord of the earth said nothing to her, for he was afraid leſt she should forsake him. Then when the eighth son was born, the king, tortured with sorrow and wishing to save his son, said to her, while she laughed a little : " Do not kill him ! Who art thou and whose daughter ? Why doſt thou wrong thy sons ? Thou child-murderess, thou haſt laid on thyself a very great and heavily-reprobated sin." The woman spoke : " Thou yearner after offspring, I am not killing thy sons, thou beſt of them granted sons. But my ſtay with thee is at an end according to the covenant we made.[2] I am Gaṅgā, Jahnu's daughter, who am served by the bands of the great Ṛishis, and I have dwelt with thee that a thing may be brought about which muſt be carried through by gods."

She now tells him how it all came about that only he could have been the father of the Vasus, and only she their mother, reveals to him that through this begetting he has won the everlaſting world of heaven, and entruſts him with the only son left him. As to this son she tells him of the words of the Muni Vasishṭha, that he will be filled with virtue, a knower of all the sciences, and, for love of his father, without any love for woman all his life long. Then she leaves the sorrowing king.[3]

[1] Or : through joyous union, love, and charm.

[2] Or : condition laid down.

[3] Cp. Chauvin, vi, 181–82, and all the cycle, huge beyond words, of the swan maiden tales, whose voluminous literature would take us too far to point out here.

It need not astonish us then, if a young widow, who is moreover a snake fairy, sets about it very earnestly when she is smitten by love's fire. Arjuna has taken on himself a vow of chastity for twelve years, and wanders through various lands. Then he comes to Gaṅgādvāra, and there bathes in the holy stream. Just as he is about to come out he is seized hold of by Ulūpī, the daughter of Kauravya, the king of the snakes, and finds himself set in the magnificent palace of her father under the waters. Laughing, he asks her who she may be, and why she has done this violence. She tells him about herself, and goes on: "At once when I saw thee immersing thyself to bathe in the stream, O tiger among men, I was utterly beside myself with love. Grant me content now, who am devoured with passion for thee, and given up to thee only, by giving thyself to me, O blameless one." Arjuna spoke: "This twelve years' chastity has been laid on me by the king of the law (Yudhishṭhira); I am not my own lord. I would fain do thee the service of love, on the one hand, thou water-wanderer, but on the other, I have never yet uttered an untruth. How may it now be that I shall not be guilty of any untruth, and yet this fortune shall come to thee? And do thou so act, O snake fairy, that my virtue may not be hurt." Ulūpī said she knew full well that he was pledged to strictest chastity, and why, but then puts it to him: "The distressed must be saved, O great-eyed one. If thou rescuest me, then thy virtue will not be harmed. And if, indeed, in this there be any slight overstepping of duty, yet thou wilt win virtuous merit by giving me life, O Arjuna. Love me, who love, O son of Pṛithā; of this the good approve. If thou doest not so, then be assured that I shall die; carry out the greatest of all duties by granting me life.[1] I have come now to thee

[1] Into such straits of conscience the man is very often driven, indeed, by women in love in Indian and other Eastern tales, or those derived from the East; while in the West it is mostly the man in love who thus presses his lady. The Minnesingers' poetry of the Middle Ages has, indeed, given very strong expression to this reality of love's catechism (see the first part of my book, *Isoldes Gottesurteil*, Berlin, 1914, *passim*). For Arthur Schnitzler, however, the artist of that highly unpleasing world from which is wafted to our nostrils a breath of

for shelter, O best among men. For thou dost ever shelter the needy and shelterless, O son of Kuntī. I come to thee for shelter, and lift my voice high in my pain. I am beseeching thee, filled with longing love. Therefore grant me the favour. Thou must fulfil the wish of me, who am in love, by giving thyself to me." Thus addressed by the daughter of the prince of the snake spirits, Kuntī's son did all as she said, seeing a reason in virtuous duty. When the loftiness-filled one had spent this night in the palace of the snake-spirit, he rose at sunrise, and came back with her to Gaṅgādvāra. Ulūpī, the good one, left him, and went into her palace, having given him as a favour the gift of never being overcome anywhere in the water: "All water-spirits will be at thy call; of that is no doubt" (i, 214).

The teller here speaks minstrelwise of a wonderful deed of one who is praised (adbhuta karman). But what is told us later (vi, 90.6 ff.) would seem to be far more wonderful. Here the fruit of this very remarkable heroic devotion to duty and virtue, a devotion concording, indeed, not only with Heracles's view in *Götter, Helden, und Wieland*, the fruit, a strapping son, presents itself to its father Arjuna. And when the scion has made known his descent, we read: "And the Pāṇḍava remembered it all just as it had happened" (çl. 14).

It must be said that the repulse of a fair one aflame with love is not always without its dangers, either elsewhere in the world or in Old India, as is shown both in other Indian works and in the Epic in various places, of which we shall speak later.

decadency and lewdness, often shamelessly frivolous and always weighed down with world-weariness, for Arthur Schnitzler, it would seem, the following was reserved: In his drama, "Das weite Land," Hofreiter, filled with dread, forsakes, at least for a time, his own wife, because she for the sake of such a phantasy of the brain and unsubstantial shadow, as is a woman's virtue, has refused her lover, whom she also loves, his last wishes, and thereby brought about his death. This Hofreiter is the pattern of a Toda. Among this people of India, according to Rivers, he is looked on as immoral, and must atone heavily in the next world for his crime, who will not give up his wife to another man (Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ii, 160).

It is even very solemnly laid down for us in a saying (xiii, 23.75): "He that comes in the way of the business of Brahmans, cows, and maidens, lands himself, of a truth, into hell." It may be that a humorous smile plays round this expressed opinion; while "hell" (niraya, naraka), too, in the Epic not seldom means, as among ourselves, a great sorrow, a great mishap, distress, ruin, even wickedness, baseness, vice.[1]

[1] See, for instance, i, 141.37; ii, 77.4; iii, 96.17; 157.23; 179.24; iv, 19.12 f.; 18.25; v, 25.7; 29.45; vii, 196.52; ix, 59.30; xii, 3.17, 18, 21; Rām., ii, 36.27.

II

Marriage

MEN in love have always been free and open in laying down rules for maidens, mostly, of course, only for their own special case, just as the sun god did for Kuntī. But we may hold the view which prevails throughout the Epic to be the usual Indian one : The daughter shall live in complete chastity and implicit obedience towards her father, mother, and other kinsfolk, and await from them her husband. Mythic examples are, of course, always to be made use of with care, just as are, indeed, the manners, customs, and so forth in the legends handed down from the dim past. We have very often to do here not with "survivals" from earlier times, but just with freely drawn figures from the eager popular fantasy, impatient of any bars, or even from a brooding meditation.

On the other hand, the father then has the express and holy duty to find a husband for his daughter. Marriage is not only necessary, but it is also the sacramental birth anew of the woman : as the man of the higher castes is born a second time by being given the holy cord, so is she through being taken by the hand (Rām., v, 19.10, cp. Manu, ii, 67, and the note in Burnell's translation).[1] In Mahābh., xiii, 24.9, we find : "He that doth not give his own grown-up fair daughter to a worthy wooer, let him be held for a Brahman-murderer." [2]

[1] The unmarried woman is asaṃskṛitā kanyā (ix, 52.12), and saṃskṛitā = the wedded woman, e.g. Yājñavalkya, i, 67 ; Vishṇu, xxii, 33 ; asaṃskṛitā the unwedded maiden Vishṇu, xxiv, 41. See, too, Jolly, "Rechtl. Stellung d. Frauen bei d. alten Indern," *Sitzungsber. d. Münchener Akad.*, 1876, p. 427.

[2] Cp. iii, 293.35 f. No less strongly do the law writings stress this duty. Each time a (ripe) unwedded maiden has her courses, her parents or guardians are guilty of the heinous crime of slaying the embryo. Vasishṭha, xvii, 71 ; Baudhāyana, iv, 1.12 f. ; Nārada, xii, 25–27 ; Yājñav., i, 64. Cp. Parāçara, vii, 6. Vasishṭha adds the

The kinds of wedlock or marriage are according to the Mahābh. eight all told: the first four or the specifically Brahmanic, under which the father hands over his daughter to the bridegroom [1] free and without any price, although in the Ṛishi form it is for two head of cattle, looked on as arhaṇa (honour shown, gift of honour) only; then there is the purchase or demon marriage, the love or Gandharva marriage, the marriage by capture (rākshasa vivāha) and the marriage by stealing, as we may perhaps call it, whereby the man gets the woman by some cunning (paiçāca vivāha).[2] These regular methods are found in i, 73.8 ff., and there the marriage by capture, but not marriage by purchase nor the Paiçāca marriage, is allowed to the warrior; but on the other hand the Vaiçya and the Çūdra may marry by purchase. So, too, the eight kinds are seen in the passage in i, 102, shortly to be dealt with. Many observations, however, are noteworthy enough to be

further condition: "if the girl has wooers," but Baudh. says: even if she has none; the latter, indeed, like Vasishṭha, xvii, 67, is inclined to grant a three years' grace, but then adds, like Manu's teaching, the threat just given. Parāçara, vii, 5, says: If a girl has reached her twelfth year, and has not been given away, then her forefathers in the other world are for ever drinking the blood she sheds every month. He has also the well-known verse wherein a girl of ten years becomes a maid (kanyā), and with this a physiologically perfect woman (vii, 4; cp. Jolly's note in SBE [= Sacred Books of the East], xxxiii, p. 170). Vishṇu, xxiv, 41, lays down: If a maid in her father's house sees her monthly courses without having been dedicated (that is, married), she is to be looked on as a Vrishali (more or less = Pariah); he that takes her for himself without more ado lays no guilt on himself. Cp. Manu, ix, 93. She has thereby lost the right to marriage, and woe to him that yet takes her. Parāçara, vii, 7. Cp. Vasishṭha, xvii, 69–71; my transl. of Kauṭilya, 356.6 ff.

[1] Great is the reward, too, in the other world, for such pious liberality. Cp., for instance, MBh., iii, 186.15; xiii, 57.25,32. According to Nārada, xii, 41, in the Ṛishi method the father besides the two head of cattle (gomithuna) also gets a garment (vastra), anyhow for the bride.

[2] This is, as is well known, the orthodox list. Cp. transl. Kauṭilya, 242.20 ff. Āpastamba, ii, 5, 11, 17 ff., and Vasishṭha, i, 28 ff. have, however, only six forms, Prājāpatya or Kāya, and Paiçāca being left out.

profitably quoted. So xiii, 44 : Yudhishṭhira spoke : "The root of all duties and virtues, of offspring and family, of the serving of the dead, of gods, and of guests—tell me what it is, O grandfather. For of all ordinances, O lord of the earth, this is held to be the most worthy of mark : To whom should the daughter be given?" Bhīshma spoke : "The good must give the daughter to a wooer gifted with excellencies, having informed themselves of his character and way of life, his knowledge, his origin, and his business. That is the Brahma form of good Brahmans. Let him that gives her away of his free will [1] win thus as son-in-law a man fitted to wed his daughter. This is the unswerving duty of the learned (that is, of the Brahmans) and of warriors. If a man without regard to his own wish (the father's, etc.) shall have to give the maiden to him whom she loves and who loves her, then the Veda-learned call this the Gandharva kind.[2] If a man buys the maiden for goods in one of the many ways and means, enticing her kinsfolk, then the wise call that the demon form. If a man by force robs the weeping girl from her home, slaying,

[1] Āvāhya goes along with āvāha. According to Böhtlingk and Monier-Williams, this word is not found in the meaning of marriage. But it is so found in xiii, 63.33 (wrongly understood by B.); and Karṇa says in v, 141, 14; āvāhaç ca vivāhaç ca saha sūtair mayā kṛitaḥ. It is the bringing hither, the marrying hither or acquisitive marriage (of the child-in-law), opposed to the marrying away or giving in marriage (of one's own child). Anukūlataḥ might also mean : in fitting wise. The passage is a hard one. I have translated in agreement with the rest of the standpoint of the Smṛiti. By far the smoothest arrangement would be to refer the relative clause to āvāhyam. Then : "With one that in fitting wise (or : of free bent) may give a gift of honour." According to the scholiast, it is true, whom I cannot follow in this, what is referred to is the buying of a bridegroom, and the prājāpatya vivāha is here meant. But elsewhere he is otherwise described.

[2] Here probably "give" = afterwards consent. Bearing in mind çloka 36, one is tempted, indeed, to translate : "Without regard to his own wish, a man shall give his daughter to him who loves her, and whom she loves. This is called the Gandharva form by those learned in the Veda." The wording also would be most naturally so translated, but there are other objections.

and cutting off the heads of the weeping (kindred), that is known as the Rākshasa form. Of five now three are lawful, and two unlawful : the Paiçāca and the demon custom must never be practised. The Brahmanic form, the warrior form, and the Gandharva form are lawful : either separately or mingled they are to be followed, of that is no doubt.[1] Three kinds of wives are for the Brahman, two for the warrior, the Vaiçya shall only wed in his own caste. The children of these (wives from different castes) are on an equality with one another (all take the father's caste). Let the Brahmanic wife be the first (of a Brahman), the Kshattriyā of a Kshattriya. For pleasure a Çūdrā is also allowed. But other people say no. The begetting of offspring with a Çūdrā wife is not a thing praised by the good. But if a Brahman begets with a Çūdrā wife, then he must atone for it.[2] Let the man of

[1] Here we have, in çloka 3–5a, the bestowal form (brāhma), which includes in itself all the first four of the orthodox scheme, which are essentially quite the same as it; in çl. 5b–6 the Gandharva form; in çl. 7 the Āsura form (purchase marriage); in çl. 8 the Rākshasa form (capture marriage). The Paiçāca form is not described. In çl. 10 kshāttra = rākshasa. The account given by Hopkins, JAOS, xiii, p. 359, I hold to be wrong. Feer, *Le mariage par achat dans l'Inde āryenne*, I do not know. Moreover, Hopkins himself (p. 36) takes rākshasa = kshāttra. And Jolly's remark in *Recht und Sitte*, p. 49, that in our passage the expression is used " in another way " seems to rest on a misunderstanding.

[2] While, for example, Manu, iii, 13 ff., holds that for this crime there is no atonement. According to Mārk.-Pur. (Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa), cxiii, 30 ff., the man must first take a wife from his own caste, then there is no objection to his marrying one from a lower caste; if he brings home first one of a lower caste, then he sinks down into this; and Agnipurāṇa, cl, 10–11, states that the children of mixed marriages take in general the mother's caste. There are no restrictions, in what the Vishṇu, xvi, 2, lays down, as to the offspring of wives of a lower caste. The law books, indeed, do not speak well of the man's marrying below him. But Manu, ii, 238, allows the pious man an otherwise excellent wife from a lowly house (dushkulā). Vasishṭha, xiii, 51–3, gives more particular information. The male offspring of the casteless man is casteless, but not the female offspring. The woman, indeed, when she weds goes out of her father's family into the husband's (this is confirmed by the other law books). A man, therefore, may marry

thirty years wed a ten-year-old wife, a nagnikā (one that has not yet menstruated), or let the man of twenty-one get one seven years old. A man shall never take for himself a woman that has no brother or no father, for she is under the duty whereby her sons must be held to be the sons of her father. Three years shall a maiden wait after the first coming of her menses, but when the fourth has come, let her get a husband herself.[1] She will then never have lost offspring and the pleasures of love. But if she do otherwise, then she offends against Prajāpati. One that on the mother's side is not akin through the offering to the dead, and not on the father's side through having the same clan (gotra)—such a wife let a man seek ; this is the law Manu proclaimed.

Yudhishṭhira spoke : "If one man has given the price, and another has said : 'I will give it,' a third demands her with violence, a fourth shows money, and a fifth has taken hold of her hand, whose wife is she then, O grandfather ? Be thou for us, who would know the truth, the eye." Bhīshma spoke : "Whatever be the deed of a human being, it is seen to serve him in life when it is furnished with holy sayings (mantra), when it is discussed with them. False words, however, are a crime leading to the loss of caste. Even a wife, a husband,[2] a high priest, a master, and the scholar's teacher are deserving of punishment, if they utter an untruth."

'No,' other people say. But Manu does not praise a living together with reluctance. What is untrue is without glory and rightness, a harm done to virtue.[3] In no man is only perverse-

such a girl, but without a dowry. Cp. Yājñav., iii, 261. See further Jolly, *Recht und Sitte*, p. 61 f.

[1] So, too, Manu, ix, 90 ff. ; Vasishṭha, xvii, 67 f. ; Baudhāyana, iv, 1.14. Others, however, give only three menstruations as the period. So Gautama, xviii, 20 ; Vishṇu, xxiv, 40. The last-named precept is perhaps of later date. Cp. Nārada, xii, 24 ; Yājñav., i, 64.

[2] Or perhaps rather : Even the lord of the wife.

[3] Dharmakopana, cp. Pāli (e.g. Milindapañho, p. 266, bhūtagāmavikopana ; my Daçak., p. 90, line 4 of the text from the bottom) ; and vidhikopana, v, 29.29 ; prakopayati dharmam, xii, 64.3, here seems = entangle, distort ; rājye sthitim akopayan, xii, 132.5 ; vidhiprakopa, v, 29.29 ; raṅgaprakopa (infringement of the laws holding for the stage), i, 135.4. Cp. also xii, 135.4.

ness to be found.[1] How should it come to be there, whether the kinsfolk give the daughter free according to the law, or whether she is bought?[2] When the kinsfolk have given their consent, holy words and sacrifices may be used, then these words have an effect; but none whatever in the case of a girl who is not (anyhow afterwards) given. Yet the mutual contract concluded with holy words by the wife and the husband is declared to be weightier than that concluded by kinsfolk.[3] The husband, according to the law's teaching,[4] acquires the wife given by the gods. So he[5] brings to nought the words of

[1] Nothing is altogether good, and nothing altogether bad, is the teaching of Jāt., No. 126; MBh., xii, 15.50.

[2] The meaning of the whole oracularly dark statement seems to be somewhat as follows: In marriage all should be agreed on with openness and friendliness. But just as no one thing in itself represents the absolutely right, so, too, none of the various kinds of marriage is utterly to be rejected. Bhīshma probably has in his mind the marriage by capture, which as a warrior and famous maiden-robber, he commended; and as he moreover altogether disapproved of purchase marriage, not to speak at all of marriage by stealing or fraud (paiçāca), so in the end the better translation is: "In the one (that is, capture marriage) there is no absolute wrongdoing. How, then, does it rightly arise (why does one accept it), even when a man robs a woman whom, however, her kinsfolk offer, and who is bought?" Perhaps tadaikena is to be read instead of tadā kena: "There is absolutely no wrongdoing to be found in this one thing: when the kinsfolk give her away free according to the law; through one thing (the other) it (the wrongdoing) then arises: when she is bought." But then the way of expression would be a somewhat twisted one. Or lastly yāṃ prayacchanti might refer to what follows. But then Bhīshma would hardly be answering Yudhishṭhira's question. As to the question what is to be done when a man has taken a girl for himself without her kinsfolk's consent, as in capture marriage (and Gandharva marriage), we seem to be given an answer in what follows.

[3] That is to say, the important persons are man and wife; and what they agree together under holy forms stands good; whereby, therefore, capture and Gandharva marriage are shown as founded on law even without taking the kinsfolk into account. Cp. Bühler's note to Manu, iii, 32, in his translation.

[4] Or: at the behest of the law (of the god of justice)?

[5] Probably the husband, simply by acquiring and holding the woman.

gods and men as untrue." Yudhishṭhira spoke : " If the maiden has already acquired (brought in) the purchase price, and a better wooer now comes, in whom virtue, love, and advantage are found in full śtrength, can we in that case speak of falsehood ? [1] Here, where from both sides there is the threat of error, he that has to act yet would fain do what is best. . . ." Bhīshma spoke : " The father in no wise accepted it with the thought : 'The price is what decides.' For the good never give their daughter because they are thinking of the price, but, it is from a wooer endowed with other advantages that the kinsfolk demand the price when a man gives her away of his own free choice, decking her out and saying : 'Take her home.' [2] And when he thus gives her away, it is no purchase price, no sale. If he has accepted it, he must then give it (to his daughter), that is a law never to be broken. If a man has earlier thus spoken : 'I will give thee my daughter,' then those are no words (that does not hold) ; if anyone has said this, or if he has said : 'No,' or : 'Of a truth' (none of that holds). Therefore they woo one another (they woo on both sides) up to the taking by the hand. The wooer of the maiden is bestowed by the Maruts, so we have heard. To none that is not according to her wishes shall a daughter be given. That is demanded by the Ṛishis. That is the root of offspring, which has its root in love. This is what I hold.[3] Pondering

[1] Or : " is a falsehood in that case something blameworthy," the fact, that is, of giving the girl to the second ? Less likely : " Need one in that case be telling a lie," that is, be disowning the earlier agreement ? Perhaps the translation is to be taken according to Nārada, xii, 30 : " Shall a man then declare (the agreement) as invalid (anṛita) or not ? " Is vācyam to be changed to vākyam ?

[2] Hardly perhaps : " saying : 'Take her home, after having decked her out' " ; where, therefore, the purchase price would consist of ornaments for the bride, or money for these.

[3] In Divyāvadāna, ed. Cowell and Neil, p. 1, we find that three things must combine together that there may be children : mātāpitarau raktau saṃnipatitau (the loving begetters) ; 2. mātā kalyā ; 3. ṛitumatī gandharvapratyupasthitā. Cp. Windisch, *Buddhas Geburt*, etc., 17 f. ; L. v. Schroeder, *Wurzeln d. Sage vom heil. Gral*, 84 f. On the view that in marriage one must only follow the urge of the heart see my note Daṇḍin's Daçakumāracaritam, p. 301 f., and with it

now, know that in this twofold business[1] there lie many mistakes, for here it is that we have to do with living together. Hear how the purchase price never decided the matter. I brought away two maidens for Vicitravīrya, having therein overcome all the Magadhas, Kāçis and Koçalas. Of one the hand had already been taken, the other had had the purchase price. 'The girl that has been taken (already by the hand) must be at once sent away,' said my father. 'Bring the other girl here.' So spoke the Kuru scion. I asked many others, since I doubted my father's word; for my father's thirst for virtue and right seemed to me mightily exaggerated.[2] Thereupon, O king, I kept on speaking these words, for I was striving after the right way: 'I would fain come to know the right way to the truth.' When now I had uttered these words, my father Bālhīka spoke as follows: 'If ye believe that it is the purchase price that decides, and not the taking by the hand, tradition (smṛiti) declares: 'He that has received the purchase price, may take steps for another wedding.'[3] For the law-learned do not state that according to tradition a guiding thread is given by the words (the agreement in marriage affairs by word of mouth). Toward those who derive the decision from the price and not from the taking by the hand, the well-known expression, too, which speaks of *giving* the daughter, does not inspire any trust (that is, it makes them out to be wrong).[4] Those who see in the purchase price a sale are not law-learned

Uttararāmacar., v, 17; vi, 12 = Mālatīmādhavam, i, 27; Kirātārj., xiii, 6 (cp. ix, 8); my *Hindu Tales*, p. 81, n. 2; p. 184, n. 1; Jātaka, Nos. 68, 237; vol. v, p. 288, ll. 18 ff.; MBh., xii, 194.27; Divyāvadāna, ed. Cowell and Neil, p. 654; Sister Nivedita, *The Web of Indian Life*, p. 187; Chavannes, *Actes du XIV. Congrès intern. des orientalistes*, 1905 (vol. 14), *Cinqu. sect.*, p. 140; Samayamātṛikā, viii, 23; Winternitz, WZKM, xxviii, 20; etc.

[1] Pāṇayos, that is, buying and selling of the girl. The word is not found with this meaning in Böhtlingk.

[2] For Bhīshma thought indeed that he had an equal right to the girl that had been taken by the hand, since he had won her by capture and fighting.

[3] Lājāntaram upāsīta. Bālhīka is the brother of Bhīshma's father. See e.g. also v, 149.14 ff.

[4] Probably less likely: it is not convincing to them.

men.[1] To such as these a man shall not give his daughter, nor shall anyone bring home such a woman ; for the wife must in no wise be bought or sold. Therewith is judgment, too, uttered on the greedy, the evil-minded, that buy and sell a woman as slave (concubine)."[2] On this matter folk asked Satyavant : " The payer of the purchase price for a girl, which latter has had the purchase price, has died, and suppose she had another man taking her hand ; we are then in doubt as to what is right. Decide thou this for us . . ." Satyavant spoke : " If so ye wish, then give her away. In this a man need harbour no hesitation. A man so does, even when (the payer of the purchase price) still lives. If he is dead, then there is no doubt whatever. The maiden may in such a case unite herself to her brother-in-law, or once again, following his guidance only, practise mortification in her longing after the taking by the hand (after actual marriage). According to some they (the brothers-in-law) lie with her at once, according to others gradually (?). Those that speak thus on this matter know the decision in this present question. The same is true where, before the taking by the hand, an interval goes by, filled with all the happiness-bringing usages and with holy sayings.[3] A fraud, however, is a crime leading to the loss of the caste. The deciding and culminating point in the holy words of the hand-taking is in the seventh step (at the wedding ceremony). She is the wife of him to whom she is given with water.[4] Thus is (the daughter) to be given away, they declare on this matter ;

[1] Were it a real, legal sale, then it would unconditionally bind.

[2] K. has the less striking reading dāsīvat " like a slave ".

[3] Then, too, nothing definitive has happened. The smoother but rather lame rendering would be : " The time leading up to the taking by the hand is that in which all happiness-bringing usages and holy sayings are put in practice."

[4] When bestowing an object on anyone water is poured on his hands. See, e.g. MBh., iii, 193.36 ; K., iv, 78.37 ; Āpast., ii, 4, 9.8 ; Jātaka, ii, p. 371 ; Raghuv., v, 59 ; Vetālap. (ed. Vidyāsāgara), p. 114 (Kathās. Tar., 93) ; Kathās., 113, towards the end. The object is given with the left hand, with the right the water is poured out (Aṅgutt.-Nik., iv, p. 210 ; Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes et apologues*, etc., iii, pp. 367, 383, 388). Hence he that gets the gift is called ārdrapāṇi or klinnapāṇi.

they know the decision. A pleasing, obedient [1] wife, given away by her brother before the holy fire, her shall the twice-born one wed, walking round the holy fire." [2]

In the next chapter we read among other things: "I do not see that in the following case any ground is given through the law of the daughter's son: the son of daughters sold belongs to his father. But those born of the marriage by purchase are envious, given up to unrighteousness, takers of other men's

[1] Or after the Bomb. text: "equal in birth," which is also very good indeed. K. reads anuvaçām.

[2] The law literature shows very many correspondencies with the teaching here set forth. Yājñavalkya, i, 65, indeed, gives us likewise the well-known maxim: "Once only is the maid given away," but goes on to say that one, however, who has been already given away can be married away once again, if a better wooer than the earlier one comes; and in Nārada, xii, 30, we find in almost literal agreement with MBh., xiii, 44.28: Kanyāyāṃ dattaçulkāyāṃ jyāyāṃç ced vara āvrajet Dharmārthakāmasaṃyukto, vākyaṃ tatrānṛitaṃ bhavet, "If the price has been given for a maid and a better wooer comes, in whom virtue, advantage, and love are to be found, then in this case the words are to be invalid." And in 28–29 he says that the rule: "Once it is that the maid is given away" is applicable only in the case of the first five kinds of marriage, that is, of the Brahma, the Prajāpati, the Ṛishi, the Deva and the Gandharva marriages; in the case of the other three all depends on the wooers' qualities. That means, then, for most cases a nullification of that holy maxim. If a maiden's bridegroom has died before the wedding has been carried out, then according to Manu, ix, 97 (cp. 69, 70) she is to be given to his brother; according to Vasishṭha, xvii, 74, Baudhāyana, iv, 1.16, even when she has been solemnly given in marriage, she is to be again married. Vasishṭha, xvii, 72, says the same. In Mahānirvāṇatantra, xi, 67, it comes as an order of Çiva to marry away such a maiden again. Nārada, xii, 24, lays it down: "If a wooer accepts a maid, and journeys thereupon into another land, then shall she let three menstruations go by, and then choose another bridegroom." The basic rule, indeed, that is followed is: Woman is the field, man the giver of the seed. Only he that has the seed shall have the field, too (Nārada, xii, 19). But neither the dead, nor the absent man can sow. Cp. my Kauṭilya, 254.3 ff.; addit. 254.3–17. But cp., for instance, Dubois-Beauchamp, *Hindu Manners and Customs*, 3rd edit., p. 40, on the later custom, wholly opposed to this.

goods, filled with malice, of evil life. Here those with the knowledge of olden times bring up the following verses sung by Yama, they, the wise in the law, they, who are bound to the law books,[1] the bridges of virtue and rightfulness. He that seeks to earn money through selling his own son, or that for the sake of his life gives away his daughter for a price, such a blind one will feed on sweat, wine, and excrement in the dreadful hell called Kāla, the deepest of the seven." Some call the yoke of cattle in the Ṛishi form a purchase price ; that is quite a mistake. Whether it were small or big there would be a sale therewith. Even if some have had a custom, it is not thereby a law for ever. We can see in the world, indeed, the practices of others too : those that carnally enjoy a maiden who is forced, such doers of evil will lie in thick darkness.[2] Indeed,

[1] Or referring to " verses " : " which are set (written down) in the law books." With the following cp. Manu, iii, 51 ff.

[2] This, of course, does not refer to capture marriage, as the scholiast holds, but to rape. That things must not be done which even gods and holy men have on their reckoning is several times stressed, as elsewhere, in the MBh. So xii, 291.17–18, 294.7. In xii, 262, we are given a splendid exposition : The way of life of the good (of the well-known penitents, etc.) has quite confused the moral ideas ; this " way of life " (ācāra) and the books praising it are rubbish washed up together from everywhere ; a man who has some importance in the world is praised by conscienceless poets greedy for fame, and everything about him is set up as an example, and so on. [N.B.—A washed up chip of wood or whisp of straw of this kind, to use the language of our text, is to be seen, too, in çl. 24 and 25. They must be cast away here ; then we get a sensible and clear text. Çl. 24 is a doublet to çl. 30 ; çl. 25 must be put before 31.] A pretty list of the lewd doings of the gods and holy men is to be found in Daçakumāra-caritam, p. 209 of my translation. Moreover in their case such " devilish tricks " do not bring about any lessening of virtue (ib., pp. 209–10). For the holy man is still unspotted, even when he is in the service of lust and brandy. Mārk.-Pur., xvii, 17 ff. Cp. MBh., xii, 141.67. The poisons of the Saṃsāra are first and foremost wine and women, and can only be driven out by wine and women (that is, the devils by Beelzebub). See Mahānirvāṇatantra, transl. by Arthur Avalon, p. cxvi and chap. viii, 269. But with both passages cp. what follows, as also M. N. Dutt in the introd. to his translation, pp. xxi–xxviii. And this is also a mystical doctrine for the initiated, and has

another human being must not be sold, how much less so one's own children ! From such a possession rooted in wrong no good can come (or : nothing right can spring). They that know the times of old bring forward this saying of Prācetasa (according to Nīl. of Daksha) : If the kinsfolk of a maiden take nothing for themselves, then it is no sale. This is an "honouring" (a gift of honour arhaṇa) of a girl, and a thing that shows very good will. And all of it without leaving anything over must be given up to the girl. Women must be honoured and adorned by father and brother, father-in-law and brother-in-law, if they wish to have much happiness. True it is that, if the wife is not pleased, then the husband, too, is not rejoiced by her ; and if the husband has no joy, then no offspring grows."

In the 47th chapter it is first set forth : the Brahman may take his wives only out of the three higher castes ; if from love, greed, or baseness he weds a Çūdrā, then he must make atonement. In sharing an inheritance the son of his Brahmanic wife first gets a tenth of the whole estate, that is to say, the most valuable things, such as carts, bulls, etc. The rest is split up into ten shares. Of these the son of the Brahman woman gets four, that of the Kshattriyā three, the son of the Vaiçyā two, that of the Çūdrā wife one, although under the law nothing whatever falls to him ; for while the Brahman's sons by the wives from the three higher castes are Brahmans, he is not one. He is given a little (alpam) or the tenth part because charity is the highest virtue, but only if the father grants it to him. Three thousand at the most is to be given to the wife as her share in the estate, and of this property given her by the husband she shall have the usufruct, which is meet and fitting. The share in the inheritance given by the husband is for the usufruct

nothing to do with the sensuality of the many. We often find, too, the assertion that the Brahman who knows the Veda, and perhaps also practises this or that good work, is pure, even though he were the most dreadful of sinners (e.g. Vasishṭha, xxvi, 19 ; xxvii, 1–9 ; Manu, xi, 262). By deeds that are in any, even the slightest relation with a particular god, above all Çiva and Vishṇu, even the most shameless offender is wholly cleansed from any stain. But this is not the place to go further into this. Cp. J. J. Meyer, *Isoldes Gottesurteil*, notes 41 and 43.

of the wives, of this property of the husband nothing shall in any wise be taken from the wife. But whatever property has been given the Brahmanic wife by her father, that her daughter is to have, for she is as the son.[1] Yudhishṭhira wonders at the property being shared so unequally among the sons of the wives from the three higher castes, for they are yet all Brahmans. Bhīshma enlightens him : "Wife" is uttered in the world with one name only, but within the name thus uttered there is a very great distinction. If a man has first of all made three (not Brahmanic) women his wives, and then gets a Brahman woman, then she is the eldest, she is the honourable one, the head-wife. The bathing and adorning of the husband, the tooth-cleaning, and the anointing, the sacrifices to gods and forbears, and all else that is done in the house on works of the holy law, all this no other may ever care for, so long as *she* is there, but the Brahman woman must attend to it for the Brahman man. Food and drink, wreath, clothing, and ornaments must be handed to the husband by the Brahman woman, for she is the most important. The Kshattriyā shall stand altogether beneath her, the wise man goes on, as the Vaiçyā again under the Kshattriyā ; for the warrior caste, as being the royal one, has a very high and weighty position for the welfare of the world. If a Kshattriya man, although he is really allowed only two kinds of wives, has three, then the sons inherit thus : the son of the Kshattriyā woman gets four-eighths and the father's war booty, the Vaiçyā's

[1] The law literature on this point has already been pointed out. According to this the wife's property (strīdhana) is what was given her by her father, mother, brother, or other kindred, what she received before the wedding-fire, or in the wedding procession, or from her husband, whether out of love or as pain-money on his taking a second wife, or what she has received otherwise since marriage, and then her purchase price (çulka). This last came to be in Old India, as, for example, among the old Germans, a gift to the bride. See Nārada, xiii, 8 ; Vishṇu, xvii, 18 ff. ; Manu, ix, 194 f. ; Yājñavalkya, ii, 143 ff. ; Agnipurāṇa, pp. 742, 925, etc. Cp. espec. Meyer, *Über das Wesen d. altind. Rechtsschr.*, etc., 76–81 ; 186 ; Kauṭilya (transl.), 243.17–245.19 and addits. ; Benoy Kumar Sarkar, *Polit. Instit. and Theories of the Hindus*, 28 ff. Worthy of note is Mahānirvāṇatantra, xii, 25, according to which, over and above this, all she has acquired herself is the wife's property (cp. xii, 111).

son three, the Çūdrā's son one, if the father so grants. Of the property of the Vaiçya man the Vaiçyā woman's son receives four-fifths, the Çūdrā woman's one, but again only if the father gives it him. As the Çūdra man can only take a Çūdrā, his sons naturally all inherit quite equally.[1]

This favouring of the higher castes is, of course, easy to understand; and just as easy to understand is it that in the Mahābhārata also, purchase marriage, not to speak at all of marriage by stealing, is treated with such contempt, although not only elsewhere in the world, but in India, too, it is an institution from olden times. The whole catechism of the ordinary Brahman had only the one word: "Give!" and the Mahābhārata itself shows us in its Brahmanic parts one ever recurring variation on this one tone; from the soft, wheedling words of the glib, sly rascal (which, however, are those least often heard) up to the shrill, crazy screaming of the dirt-begrimed, howling dervish, with fantastically matted shaggy hair, this all-conquering word of barefaced beggardom runs right through the mighty Epic. How then should the Brahmans not have seen the highest good, and what at least for them was the only dignified course, in those forms of marriage which imply a giving away of the

[1] The law books are usually less hard than the Epic against the Çūdrā woman's son. True, Manu, ix, 155, too, lays it down he is to have what the father finds good to give him; but otherwise, so far as I can see, this restriction is not found. Gautama, xxviii, 39, allows the Çūdra son, even of an otherwise sonless Brahman, only the means of subsistence (vṛittimūla); Vasishṭha, xvii, 48–50, pays no heed to him at all, and so on. According to Baudhāyana, ii, 2, 3.10 (= ii, 2.10) and Yājñavalkya, ii, 125, of the Brahman's sons that of the Brahman woman inherits four-tenths, that of the Kshattriyā three-tenths, that of the Vaiçyā two-tenths, that of the Çūdrā one-tenth; the sons of the Kshattriya man get three-sixths or two-sixths or one-sixth, those of the Vaiçya man two-thirds or one-third. So, too, Bṛihaspati, xxv, 27 ff. and Vishṇu, xviii, 1 ff.; only Vishṇu says nothing whatever about the sons of the Vaiçya man. Baudhāyana and Manu, ix, 153 ff., deem only a Brahman's sons worthy of a detailed treatment. Bṛihaspati, xxv, 32, lays down that the Çūdrā woman's son can have one of the ten shares only where land is not in question. Cp. Bühler's note to Manu, ix, 153; Kauṭilya (transl.), 259.1–19 and addit. 259.27–28.

bride without, or essentially without, any price being paid ![1] The warrior, on the other hand, found his pride in quite another direction. "Take!" was his shibboleth—first of all: "Take for thyself by main force! Thou art the strong one and to the strong belongs the earth." But then it gratifies the pride of the mighty man if he can say to others: "There, take it!" And always we are hearing in the Mahābhārata: The Kshattriya can only bestow, never can he let anything be bestowed on him; and often the contempt for the Brahman, ever begging and accepting, finds expression. In the tale of Devayānī and Çarmishṭhā we have already seen an example of this. The warrior, therefore, praised marriage by capture, and with it the Gandharva marriage, in which latter, likewise, leave was asked of no one on earth, but the more or less reluctant maiden was carried off as booty. Not only Kṛishṇa, the conscienceless fellow, who rose to the lofty dignity of highest god from being

[1] Cp. MBh., iii, 186.15. Here, too, as is usual in the world, sheer selfishness, therefore, is the tap-root of progress and of a loftier ethic. But in saying this we would not deny that there was also a stream to be found among the Brahmans, rising from nobler depths; for it is the strivings of this very priestly caste that India has to thank, in spite of much that is so unpleasing, for an infinity of good and lovely things in the domain not only of the intellectual but also of the ethical. Priestly hands have done dreadful wrongs to the Epic poetry; but on the other hand, very many splendid treasures, for instance, of the Indian mind in narrative literature have been smothered by the pious anointing oil of the Buddhists and Jains, or at least distorted, and thus, at any rate, preserved. Hertel in particular has pointed this out. On the new and the loftier in the world of philosophy, religion, and ethics the priestly class, however, has never and nowhere on earth looked with friendly eyes; and the purer ethic in particular has always at first a hard fight with the religion in power, the upholder of the old ways. It is full of meaning to find that the founder both of Buddhism and of Jainism belonged to the warrior nobility. It would still be left, then, to show how far the Indian priestly class in its ethical views, too, followed its own impulse and not the pressure brought to bear on it by other sections of the population, and probably by isolated Brahmans. Indeed in the world it is always individuals at first that have risen as reformers against their times, and it is quite likely that the insurgent transformers came, too, from the priesthood.

an obscure new-comer, is set before us as a bold woman-snatcher (v, 48.74 ; 158.7 ff. ; cp. iii, 12.31, 115 f.),[1] and not only the Arjuna so wrongly praised to the skies by later revisers of the Kuru saga, but also the truly noble Bhīshma. Among his heroic deeds we often find the abduction of maidens (e.g. in vi, 13.6 ; xii, 46.13), and when he is dead, his mother Gaṅgā sings his praises for this, too (xiii, 168.26, 27). Twice the Mahābhārata tells the tale of how he carried off the daughter of the king of Kāçi for his half-brother Vicitravīrya (i, 102 ; v, 173). In the first and very vivid passage we read : " When now Bhīshma, wisest of the wise, saw that his brother had reached manhood's years, he set his thoughts on finding him a wife. Then Bhīshma heard how the three daughters of the king of Kāçi (like the fairies of heaven they were) were all holding their choice of a husband. Thereupon this best of the chariot-fighters, the overcomer of his foes, the mighty one, with the approval of his mother drove with one chariot to Vārāṇasī. There Bhīshma, Çāntanu's son, now saw gathered together the kings that had come from all sides, and these maidens. But when the names of all the kings were called out, and the surpassingly glorious maidens saw the lonely, old Bhīshma, they all, as though gripped by an unrest, ran away from him, with the thought : 'He is an old man.' 'On what ground has the Bharata steer shamelessly come hither, old, with a surpassingly virtuous soul, wearing wrinkles and white hair ? What will he say, who stands there among the people a breaker of his vow ? For false is the renown on earth of Bhīshma as one thirsting after chastity.' So spoke the low-souled among the princes, and laughed. When now Bhīshma, the mighty one, heard the words of the Kshattriyas, he was fired with anger, himself he made these maidens' choice, and spoke with voice of thunder to the wardens of the earth, as he, Bhīshma, that strikes in all directions, lifted the maidens onto his chariot : 'The bestowal of daughters on valiant men, when these have themselves been summoned, has been handed

[1] In the twenty-sixth chap. of the 5th book of the Vishṇupur. and elsewhere the song is sung of how Kṛishṇa carried off Rukminī on the eve of her solemn wedding with Çiçupāla.

down in tradition by the wise. While they deck out their daughters to the best of their power, and even pay money besides, others offer them for a yoke of cattle. Others win consent for a fixed sum of money, and others again through force. Others approach men who are unaware of anything, and others wed on their own terms.[1] Others acquire a wife by following the Ṛishi way. Then, as the eighth kind, know ye that one chosen out by the poets.[2] The self choice by the maiden (svayaṃvara) again is praised and practised by the nobility. The carrying away by main force of the maiden, however, is declared by the law-learned to be the best thing.[3] These maidens here, ye herders of the earth, I mean to take away hence by force. Make ready with all your strength, whether now it is for victory or for defeat. Here stand I, ye herders of the earth, resolved to fight.' When he of the heroic soul, the Kuru scion had thus spoken to the wardens of the earth and the king of Kāçi, and had lifted all the maidens onto his chariot and taken leave of the gathering, he drove swiftly away with these maidens. Then sprang up in rage all those princes, feeling their arms and biting their lips. Great was the confusion among them, as in tearing haste they took off their ornaments, and girded on their armour. Like the meeting together of stars was this gathering of all the ornaments and the armour from every side,[4] owing to the ornaments being strewn about here and there with the armour.[5]

[1] Wishing to have the maiden in marriage (prārthitā)—in the Prājāpatya form. Cp. Agnipur., 154.10b; Vishṇu's law-book, xxiv, 22.

[2] The Gandharva marriage, anyhow, not, as the comm. has it, the Rākshasa form. It would be possible, of course, to find the Gandharva form already in anumānya, as K. indeed does. Then the meaning would be: "Know now that this is the eighth kind of taking home chosen by the wise." Kavi as a matter of fact in the MBh. quite usually means "the wise man, seer, master".

[3] Or: "They declare the marriage by capture to be the oldest."

[4] The armour, too, was ornamented with gold and precious stones. When Yudhishṭhira's armour was shot to pieces with arrows in the fight by night, we read: "It fell down in tatters like a swarm of stars from the sky" (vii, 165.39; cp. viii, 49.42 f.).

[5] Can go with what follows; then we should have a kind of loc. absol.: "While the ornaments . . . were being strewed about,

Their brows were drawn with anger and indignation, and their eyes reddened ; thus did these heroes climb into their chariots, made ready by their drivers, shining, harnessed to noble steeds, and now set out, brandishing their weapons, after the Kuru scion as he drove off. Then between them and him, between the one and the many, there was fought a raging, fear-bringing fight. . . . But when the best of all arm-bearers had overcome them in the fight, he went on his way, down to the Bhāratas, the Bhārata he. Bhīshma, Çāntanu's son, was attacked from behind by the Çālva king, the great chariot-fighter, he the man of unfathomed mind, as the warden of the herd, the strongest of the strong, who is after the female, thrusts another elephant in the back with his two tusks.[1] Yearning for the woman, the prince shouted to Bhīshma : " Stop ! Stop ! " he the Çālva king, the strong-armed, goaded by rage. Then this tiger among men, the tormentor of the foemen's armies, roused by his words, blazing up with anger like a smokeless fire, his stretched bow in hand and his forehead in furrows, faithfully followed the warrior custom and turned his chariot round to meet the Çālva, without fear or confusion, he the great chariot-fighter. When all these kings saw he had turned about, they came up as onlookers to the meeting between Bhīshma and the Çālva. The two men endowed with strength and valour rushed on one another like two strong bellowing bulls fighting for the cow. Then the Çālva king, the best of men, overwhelmed Bhīshma, Çāntanu's son, with quick flying arrows in hundreds of thousands. When now these princes saw Bhīshma at first brought into evil plight by Çālva they were astonished and shouted : " Bravo, bravo ! " . . . When now Bhīshma, Çāntanu's son, the taker of foemen's strongholds, heard the words of the Kshattriyas, wrathfully he said : " Stay, stay ! " And grimly he spoke to his charioteer : " Drive to where that

these heroes, whose brows . . . were drawn with anger, and whose eyes were reddened," etc. A like instrum. absol. is repeatedly found in the Epic. Cp. for example vii, 196.12 ; xii, 264.61–63 ; Rām., ii, 111.12.

[1] As we shall learn later, the Çālva king was the secret betrothed of the eldest of the princesses

king is ! I will kill him as the prince of birds kills a snake." Warding off with arrows the arrows of the Çālva king, Bhīshma, the Kuru scion, brought down his driver, Bhīshma the tiger among the rulers of earth. With Indra's arrow magic he slew his splendid horses. For the maiden's sake, Bhīshma, Çāntanu's offspring, then let the beśt of men go off alive. Then Çālva went to his city, and the prince thereafter ruled his empire with juśtice. And the kings that were there to witness the svayaṃvara, they too went back again to their kingdoms, they the takers of foemen's śtrongholds. When Bhīshma, the beśt of śtrikers in the fray, had thus won the maidens, he went off to Hāśtinapura, where the king, the Kuru offspring, Vicitravīrya the juśt, ruled this earth, like his father, the Kuru offspring Çāntanu, the beśt among men. The son of Gaṅgā, in a short time, went through foreśts and rivers, mountains and trees of the mośt various kinds (the man of boundless valour in the fray, having worked havoc among the foe, himself unscathed), and he brought away the daughters of the king of Kāçi, he the virtuous one, as though they were his daughters-in-law, as though they were his younger siśters. As though with his own daughters, the śtrong-armed one drove into the Kuru land, and brought them thither, seeking to do his brother's pleasure. These maidens endowed with every excellence, won by a hero's prowess, the brother Bhīshma handed over to his younger brother Vicitravīrya. He, learned in the law, having thus carried out in harmony with the law a deed beyond human powers, went on to marry away his brother Vicitravīrya."

In the second account (v, 173 ; cp. 176.44 ff.) given by Bhīshma himself, he declares that it was because the maidens were vīryaçulkā (whose price is heroic valour) that he robbed them (çl. 14) ; and in it he is always calling out : " Bhīshma, son of Çāntanu, is robbing the maidens." Duryodhana does the same as Bhīshma. He drives in a gold-decked chariot together with Karṇa and other heroes into the royal city of the Kaliṅgas, where the princess is to hold her ceremonial choice of a husband, and a great and splendid band of kings has come together. Accompanied by her nurse and by eunuchs,[1] the young beauty

[1] These, of course, show that the tale in at leaśt its present form is of a late date. It is found, too, in the 12th Book.

walks across the platform, as the kings' names are told her, but passes by Duryodhana. This hurts his angry pride ; he falls on her, lifts her onto his chariot, and drives off with her. The other wooers follow, but in the hot fight they all have to yield before Karṇa's incomparable heroism and strength, and Duryodhana bears off his booty (xii, 4). Bhīshma's rape of the girls had evil results of which we shall hear later, and moreover kindled an undying enmity between him and the family of the abducted maidens. But usually the maidens' kindred put up with the deed. We even are told, indeed, of a famous case where from the very start the girl's brother lends his help.

Arjuna during his time of banishment and " chastity " comes to the Yādavas in Dvārakā, and there lives with Kṛishṇa in the most intimate friendship. The Vṛishṇis and Andhakas hold a festival in honour of the mountain Raivata, whereat men and women give themselves up to all kinds of frolic and mad enjoyment. Then we read in i, 219.13 ff. : " While this wonderful dazzling festival was being held, Kṛishṇa and Arjuna walked about together. Wandering round they saw there the glorious daughter of Vasudeva, the bedecked Subhadrā, amidst her girl friends. When Arjuna saw her, at once love woke within him. Kṛishṇa saw that his thoughts were of her only. The tiger among men spoke, laughing slightly : " Is the heart of the forest-dweller stirred by love ? An it please thee, that is my sister, sprung from the same womb as Sāraṇa, O son of Pṛithā, Subhadrā her name, my father's beloved daughter. If thou hast intentions, I will speak with my father." Arjuna said : " She is Vasudeva's daughter and Kṛishṇa's sister, and lit up by loveliness ; whom would she not, indeed, ensnare ! All my happiness would undoubtedly be fulfilled, if the Vṛishṇi maiden, this sister of thine, were my wife. But what means is there to get her ? Tell me of it, O Janārdana. Then I am ready to do anything, if it is possible for a man." Kṛishṇa spoke : " The Svayaṃvara is the way of marriage of the Kshattriyas, O bull among men, but it is bound up with doubt and danger because of the whimfulness of woman's nature. The carrying away by force is also held in honour by the Kshattriyas. Those wise in the laws know it as the marriage way of heroes. Do thou, O Arjuna, take my fair

sister by force. For who knows what she will do at the Svayaṃvara?" Now when Arjuna and Kṛishṇa had made up their minds how the thing was to be done, they sent messengers to let Yudhishṭhira, who was in Indraprastha, know of everything. And when the long-armed one had learnt, the son of Pāṇḍu allowed it. Being now authorized in the matter of this union, and with Kṛishṇa's leave, Arjuna, the Bharata bull, went forth according to Kṛishṇa's plan, when he knew the maiden to be on the mountain Raivataka. In a chariot whose parts were of gold, which was equipped in full order, harnessed to Çaibya and Sugrīva (horses of Kṛishṇa), wreathed with a multitude of little bells, and fitted with all kinds of weapons, which sounded, too, as the voice of the cloud, was like unto flaming fire, and destroyed the joy of foes—in this chariot the bull among men drove forth under pretext of hunting, armed, clad in armour, wearing his sword, with the leather protector for the left arm, and the bowman's finger-cap. Subhadrā was now coming back to Dvārakā, having offered worship to the mountain prince Raivataka and all the gods, and had the Brahmans to utter wishes for blessings, and having wandered to the right round the mountain. Arjuna rushed down on her, and lifted her into his chariot, he that was tortured by love's arrow thus did unto Subhadrā, lovely in every limb. Then the tiger among men drove with this brightly smiling one on the chariot built of gold to his city. But when the soldiery saw Subhadrā being carried off, they all ran shouting in the direction of the city of Dvāravatī. When they had all come to the assembly hall Sudharmā,[1] they told the warden of the hall of all this heroic deed of Arjuna. So soon as the warden of the hall had heard it from them, he beat the drum that calls to arms, the loud-sounding drum, mounted in gold. Aroused by this din, the Bhojas, Vṛishṇis, and Andhakas, leaving their food and drink, now came rushing up from every side.

A very stormy meeting is now held; chariots, arms, and equipment are put into order; Baladeva, the drunken elder

[1] Or perhaps better: When they had swiftly reached the assembly hall. Abhitas swift, quick is often found in the MBh., although the dictionaries give this meaning as unsupported (iii, 3.67; 175.16; 240.1; 266.7; 276.4; vii, 113.66; etc.).

brother of Kṛishṇa, in a fury curses the rascally Arjuna, who thus repays their hospitality, first eating the food, and then breaking the vessel, and threatens by himself alone to make the earth Kaurava-less. But Kṛishṇa makes a speech "in the service of virtue and profit": "It is not contempt that Arjuna has shown towards our family, there is no doubt as to that. He holds you Sātvatas never to be greedy for gain; and the son of Pāṇḍu believes that one should not venture on the Svayaṃvara. Who would care, too, like a brute to approve the giving away of a daughter![1] And the sale, too, of a child—what human being on earth would choose to carry it out! These mistakes have been seen by Kunti's son, that is what I hold. That is why the son of Pāṇḍu has carried away the maiden according to law and wont. On the one hand the union is a fitting one, on the other this so excelling son of Pṛithā has actually accomplished the rape of the glorious Subhadrā. Who would not choose, indeed, to have Arjuna, the son of Kuntibhoja's daughter, born in the line of Bharata and the famous Çāntanu! And I see none that could overcome the son of Pṛithā by his might in battle but Çiva. . . . Hasten with the most friendly words to Arjuna, and thus move him to come back. This is my most true opinion. Were Pṛithā's son to overcome you, and go back by force to his city, then your renown would come to nought at one blow. But if there is friendly appeasing, there is no talk of defeat." Thus is Arjuna brought back and wedded to Subhadrā[2] (cp. also viii, 37.34).

[1] Or: "the giving away like a head of cattle," that is, her being given away like a head of cattle.

[2] K. after çloka 25 of the Bomb. ed. (which here shows some difference) has inserted almost 150 çlokas, showing a really crazy distortion. On Kṛishṇa's advice Arjuna disguises himself as a Yati, is honoured by Baladeva and his comrades as a holy man, brought by Kṛishṇa into the apartments of his sister Subhadrā, and given into her care, the cunning fellow spinning a tale to her: "For in olden times the Yati who were of the calling of begging monks dwelt in the apartments of the Daçārhas' maidens. The maidens that were in the harem gave them soft and hard foods, according to the time, and were untiring in it." Arjuna's excellencies have already been praised before Subhadrā by Kṛishṇa and others, and she has long quite fallen in love with the hero through hearsay. Arjuna on his side sighs and groans

In vii, 10.33, 55 also, the carrying off of women is hailed as a great deed of two heroes in Yudhishṭhira's army (cp. çl. 60, and xii, 45.13). The dying Bhīshma praises in vi, 122.17 Karṇa's heroism, when carrying off maidens. When the angry Çiçupāla in ii, 41.22, 23 declares that it was an ill deed of Bhīshma to have carried off Ambā, who already loved another, that means little. Moreover he, the rightly thinking one, let her go again at once, when he came to know of her inclination. So the abduction of women is seen, too, in the comparison: "Suçarman took the king of the Matsyas as

like a true lover that has ever the object of his as yet unfulfilled last wishes before him. At length she grasps the fact that the Yati is Arjuna, and draws him into a jesting talk; he discloses himself, and they avow their mutual love. From shame Subhadrā now falls quite ill, and after the manner of later literature the love-sickness of the maiden is described. The whole people with her father at their head go off to a thirty-four days' festival on an island. Arjuna makes use of the opportunity (which has been purposely brought about for him by Kṛishṇa and the kinsfolk), and asks of Subhadrā the Gandharva union. Of it he says that it is brought about from passion and the yearning for sons, and ensures an obedient and fruitful wife; as opposed to the other four kinds of marriage this fifth one is entered upon by the two lovers without holy ceremony and without friends. Next night he would fain accomplish this marriage with her. But she only weeps. Then Arjuna at a loss calls up through his thoughts his father Indra, and the whole host of the heavenly and the holy ones (indeed even the Yadus come with Vasudeva at their head), and they wed him to the princess. Kṛishṇa comes, offers him his chariot, urges him to go to Khāṇḍavaprastha, and then discreetly vanishes away likewise to the island. Arjuna bids Subhadrā to have the chariot harnessed under pretext of a holy journey, and to bring it thither. She herself then serves him as a very skilful driver, and finds a great joy when an army opposes her beloved one, and of course is overcome by him. But the leader, who has been told of everything by Kṛishṇa, jumps from his chariot, embraces Arjuna, and the hero drives away with his blessing and good wishes. Then follows çloka 3, 1 and 2 of the 220th chapter of the Bomb. ed. being omitted: Rathena kāñcanāṅgena, together with 4 and 5; then a verse to the effect that Arjuna with an army and Subhadrā goes off in the direction of his city. Verse 9 of the Bomb. ed. comes next, and then the rest essentially the same as this text (i, 239 ff. in K.).

prisoner alive ; lifting him up by force onto his chariot, as the lover does a maid (yuvatī), he drove off with swift steeds " (iv, 33.8–9).[1] However, the carrying off of a bride is often rather an elopement (e.g. MBh., iii, 224.1–4).

But to carry off the wedded wife of a man, which not only often among savages and barbarians,[2] but, as is well known, also, for instance, among our Germanic forefathers, was looked on as a glorious deed, is a thing which is very strongly condemned ; and xii, 35.25 lays down an atonement for this

[1] It is true that marriage by capture is more than once represented as wrong, and according to Vasishṭha, xvii, 73, and Baudh., iv, 1.15, a girl that has been carried off, but not wedded to the accompaniment of the holy song texts, can be given away again as a virgin. But Vasishṭha, i, 34, brings forward this very form as that of the Kshattriyas (kshāttra), and Baudh., i, 11, 20.12 holds that it and purchase marriage correspond with the laws or customs of the warrior nobility ; so also Manu, iii, 24 and 26. Mārk.-Pur. states in cxxxiii, 27 ff. that it is still better for the warrior than the Gandharva marriage, and in cxxii ff. Prince Avīkshita carries off many princesses at their Svayaṃvara, because they do not choose him out ; his heroic mother praises him for it, when he has been taken prisoner in the fight thus brought about, and fires him on to go to war. And there are other such cases. It has often been stated that the very name Rākshasa marriage points to the Aryans having found this form, as also the Āsura or purchase marriage, already among the primitive population, and called it thus after them (e.g. J. Lippert, *Kulturgesch. d. Menschheit*, 1887, Bd. ii, p. 95 ; *Anthropos*, iv, pp. 7 ff., especially 10 ; vii, 102). It would be easy to see how, corresponding to these names, those may have been invented for the other kinds of marriage. But probably the Aryan settlers did not have to be introduced by the aborigines to such ways of marriage ; and I think the terminology arose rather from the " Brahmanic " kind, it being interpreted as " Brahma marriage ". Both marriage by capture and marriage by purchase are, indeed, Indo-Germanic. See e.g. Feist, *Indogermanen*, 305–308.

[2] Of the American Indians, for instance, we often are told that the stronger man simply takes his wife away from the weaker, just as the men do in the knightly age of Europe ; and among the pre-Islamic Arabs it was looked on as highly praiseworthy to take for oneself the wife of the beaten foe (see e.g. *Anthropos*, v, pp. 983 ff. ; Welhausen, *Götting. Nachr.* 1893, p. 435). To the conqueror, indeed, is the booty. See too 5 Moses, 21.10 ff.

crime. Even from the robber it is expected that he shall keep from stealing women, as also from intercourse with the wives of others (xii, 133.17) ; cp. what the pious robber in 135.13, 14 demands from his men.[1] In the list of Çiçupāla's sins it is also remarked that he has stolen a man's wife, also, however, that he has carried off a girl, though, indeed, not for marriage (ii, 45.10 f.).[2]

The Svayaṃvara, which has been spoken of in the tales we have just given, is one of the splendours of the Indian Epic, not only of older times, but also of later times, and is also often found in the prose tales. It is perhaps generally known from the song of Nala and Damayantī. It was assuredly never a universal custom, but was confined to daughters of Kshattriyas, especially royal princesses. Therefore, at least in the view of the warrior nobility, only this nobility had the right to such wooing.[3]

In Mahābh., i, 122, several kings desire Kuntī, her that is adorned with the highest womanly perfections. Her father holds a Svayaṃvara for her. When she sees the glorious Pāṇḍu among the kings, she is at once fired with love, shyly hangs the garland on his shoulder and the wedding is held

[1] In Anguttaranikāya, iv, p. 339, we read that among the eight qualities that kept a " great " thief or a professional robber on a bigger scale from a speedy fall, and made it possible for him to carry on for a long time, there was this one : " He does not kill a woman, he forces or deflowers no maid."

[2] Bṛihaspati, xxii, 18, enjoins that he who steals a married woman shall be burned on a red-hot gridiron with a straw fire.

[3] Hopkins holds that this splendid knightly Svayaṃvara of the Epic is not a survival from earlier times, but a later growth, and he is probably quite right. He distinguishes, then, two kinds : the older primitive self-choice, and the later splendid form (JAOS, xiii, 168, 169, 357, 360). The fairest Svayaṃvara in the Epic, Sāvitrī's, is on very simple lines, and only at it is the maiden quite free in choosing her husband. As we know, Sāvitrī drives in her chariot through the land and thus makes an inspection, a proceeding that by no means fits into the framework of the usual or court tales of the Svayaṃvara. In the house of King Māndhātar it is, at least according to his words, the custom for the daughters themselves to choose their husband in freedom. Wilson's Vishṇupurāṇa, iii, 270.

without further hindrance. The same thing exactly happens in Damayanti's case, although here there is some slight bantering by the gods.[1] But generally things do not go on so smoothly, a thing of which the literary Epic of later times has likewise made use. So Kṛishṇa overcomes the angry rivals, and triumphantly carries off the daughter of the king of the Gandhāras.

From more than one point of view the self-choice by Draupadī is interesting (i, 184 ff.). It belongs to that probably older variety where there is no question of the girl's making a choice, but the decision is reached through a trial of warrior skill.[2]

[1] Things would seem to go just as peacefully with Devikā, who chooses Yudhishṭhira, and with Vijayā, who chooses Sahadeva, while Bhīmasena gets Balaṃdharā as vīryaçulkā (i, 95.76 ff.). But here we have only a short account. This comparison is instructive: "As at a Svayaṃvara they (the warriors) rained blows on one another in the turmoil of the fight" (vi, 93.42). Cp. Mārkaṇḍeyapur., cxxii ff.; cxxxiii, 8 ff.

[2] It is a fight or a contest that often gives the decision between rivals for a girl among primitive peoples (Westermarck, 159–163; McLennan, *Primitive Marriage*, 181). The winning of a bride through skill with the bow, which is often found in India, we find reported also of the American Indians (Finck, *Primitive Love*, pp. 57–58) as also the widespread bow that can only be stretched by the strongest man (Boas, *Chinook Texts*, p. 80). On the other hand in the Shahnameh the choosing of a husband by Katajun, who hands Gushtasp a rose-wreath, and so makes him her husband, reminds us strongly of the typical Indian scenes. So, too, for instance, the Buddhistic tale in Schiefner, *Bull. d. Petersburger Ak.*, Bd. xxiii, col. 23 ff., is quite after this style of tale. There we find: "Thereupon the king made proclamation in various lands and cities that his daughter was going to hold a ceremony for choosing a husband, and had that city cleansed of rubbish, stones, and potsherds, sprinkled with sandal-water, and made fragrant with sweet perfumes, awnings, banners, and flags set up, many silken hangings hung with flowers of many kinds, like a grove of the gods, and the joyous proclamation made: 'Hear ye, O honourable city and country-dwellers, and the throngs of people come from various parts! Forasmuch as the King's daughter is minded to-morrow herself to make her choice of a husband, do ye gather together as is meet and fitting.' Next morning the king's daughter, wearing many

Pāṇḍu's sons, who with their mother have escaped from the burning of the house of resin, and have to wander about the world unknown, go disguised as Brahmans, to witness Draupadī making her choice of a husband. On the way they meet with a great band of Brahmans, and are cheerfully hailed by them : " Come at once with us into the land of the Pañcālas, to Drupada's palace ; a great Svayaṃvara with vast pomp is going to be held there. We set out as one united band of travellers, and are going thither. For it will be a wondrous splendid, and very great festival there. The daughter of Yajñasena, of the great-souled Drupada, is she who came forth from the midst of the sacrificial altar, she with the lotus-leaf eyes, worthy to be seen, with faultless limbs, very gentle and understanding, the sister of Dhṛishṭadyumna, the foe of the Droṇas, and shining with power, who was born from the brightly glowing fire, armoured, sword-girt, with bow and arrow, long-armed, like unto fire. His sister is she, the slender, faultlessly-limbed Draupadī, from whom is wafted a kroça away a scent like that of the blue lotus. We go to behold Yajñasena's daughter, awaiting with longing the Svayaṃvara, and to see this divine high festival. There will come thither kings and kings' sons, rich in sacrifices, bestowing many gifts, zealous in the holy study, pure and noble-hearted and pious, young and handsome, journeying from various places, and great chariot-fighters and princes skilled in

kinds of ornaments, ringed round by many maidens, came into a grove decked with flowers by the god thereof, surpassing fair through the great gift of happiness, while in the middle of the city many thousand people had gathered together, (she came) into the gathering to choose herself a husband. Kshemaṅkara (the blind son of a king, going about as a beggar) also sat at another place, playing the lute. As men stand in reciprocal relation according to their deeds, and through the great power of the cause the power of the effect is aimed at, so the king's daughter, when her mind was touched by the notes of the lute, clung fast to Kshemaṅkara's lute as he played, and saying : 'This is my man,' she threw the flower wreath over him." The same tale is found in Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes et apologues*, ii, pp. 389 ff., see especially pp. 393 ff. Dozens of tales, indeed, especially Jain, at a later time describe such events. Cp. also Basset, *Contes et Légendes Arabes*, Revue des trad. popul., xiv, p. 118.

arms. These rulers of men will, that they may win the victory, give many presents there, treasures, cows, hard and soft food of every kind. All this we are going to receive, to see the Svayaṃvara, take our share in the festival, and then go off again whither we desire. Mummers, vaitālikas, sūtas, māgadhas,[1] dancers, and strong wrestlers will come there from all the quarters of the world. When ye high-souled ones have thus sated your curiosity,[2] looked on the festival, and received the gifts, then ye can come back again with us. And if Kṛishṇā (that is, Draupadī) sees you all standing there so handsome and with godlike stature, then she may by the working of chance choose one of you as bridegroom. This brother of thine is splendid, worthy to behold, strong-armed; if he is

[1] All three are bards and singers of princes' praises. The vaitālika calls out the hours of the day, and recites blessings; the māgadha is, according to the scholiast, a genealogist. In vi, 127.3, indeed, he remarks that the vaitālika is vaṃçāvalīkīrtaka. The most important is the sūta, chariot-driver to the prince, and likewise one that knows and gives a masterly rendering of old songs and traditions, especially of the great deeds of the ruler and his forefathers. It was from this caste, perhaps, that came the makers and carriers of that old song poetry, fragments of which have been strung together in the Epic, especially in the Mahābhārata, but alas! not without having been often mutilated thereby and distorted. The modern bhāts (and chārans) or bards, among the Rājputs (and Marathas), about whom Devendra Das in his *Sketches of Hindoo Life*, pp. 179 ff., gives a very good account, are undoubtedly their very near kindred, if not their descendants.

These bards enjoy among the Rājputs greater consideration than the Brahmans (Tod, *Rajasthan*, i, 30; 217; cp. ii, 127 below. D. N. Das, *Sketches of Hindoo Life*, 179). A bhāt was chief representative and army commander of Darjan Sal of Kotah (Tod, ii, 535). Their person is sacred (i, 742; ii, 182; 674 ff.). Mārkaṇḍeyapur., vi, 23 ff. shows the pride of the sūta, and that to kill him is looked on as Brahman murder. He occupies holy (standing in connection with the Veda?) or Brahmanic rank (brāhmaṃ padam 30, brāhmaṃ sthānam 32); and these expressions would hardly be called "holy place". Cp. further Crooke, *The North-Western Provinces*, 205, 224, and especially my Kauṭilya, index under sūtas. As to the power the bards held through their knowledge of songs see Tod, i, p. xi; 672; ii, 697.

[2] Or perhaps: taken part in the festivities (kautūhalaṃ kṛitvā)?

commissioned for the victory he will perhaps get much wealth thereby, and assuredly increase the measure of your joy." Yudhishṭhira spoke: "We wish to see the most splendid enjoyment and the great festival, all together with you to see the Svayaṃvara of the maiden."

When they had come to Pañcāla-land, the five took lodging with a potter, and begged after Brahman wise. . . . "The king of the Pañcālas had had a stout bow made ready for stringing, and a machine set up in the air. To this machine the prince had ordered the mark to be fastened. Drupada spoke: 'Whoso strings this bow, and, setting the arrows on it, shoots through the mark, shall have my daughter.' With these words the king had the Svayaṃvara proclaimed. At these tidings all the kings gathered together there, as also the high-souled Ṛishis, to witness the Svayaṃvara. Also the Kurus with Duryodhana at their head, accompanied by Karṇa, came thither, and distinguished Brahmans from various lands. Received with honour by Drupada, these bands of kings took their seats on the tribunals, eager to behold the Svayaṃvara; then all the townsfolk, with a din as of the sea. To the north-east the princes strode, and took their seats. North-east of the city, on a smooth clear place shone the enclosure for the gathering, set around with dwellings, having a mound and ditch, adorned with gates and gateways, made fair around with a many-coloured awning, filled with the hundreds of musical instruments, made fragrant with precious aloe-wood, sprinkled with sandal-water, bright with wreaths and garlands, ringed all round by many splendid palaces that were like unto the peak of Kailāsa, and brushed the sky; and these palaces had pinnacles well updrawn, were wrapped in gold as in a net, adorned with floors of mosaic of precious stones, fitted with easily climbed stairs, and furnished with magnificent seats; they were covered in wreaths and garlands, and scented with the most precious aloe-wood; they shone like swans and like the moon's beam, and a yojana away they sent out a fragrant smell; hundreds of unthronged doors they had, and shone with couches and seats; their parts were covered with many kinds of metals, and they were like unto the tops of Himālaya. There all the fine-decked princes took up their quarters,

in varied palaces, vying with one another . . . . And on most exquisite tribunals the folk from the city and the country took their seats all round, that they might catch sight of Kṛishṇā. Together with the Brahmans the sons of Pāṇḍu likewise took their seats, gazing at the incomparable wealth of the king of the Pañcālas. While now the assembly was being held, Draupadī, on a lovely day, the sixteenth, came up onto the platform, having bathed her limbs, and wearing a fair garment, decked with every kind of ornament, and bearing a golden, magnificently made wreath on her head. The house-priest of the Somakas, a pure Brahman, learned in mantras, strewed (kuça grass) about, and then offered up clarified butter in the fire after the holy precept. Having appeased the flame god, and bid the Brahmans utter the blessing, he ordered all the musical instruments around to stop. When now a silence had come on them, Dhṛishṭadyumna, who had a voice like the trumpet of the clouds, took Kṛishṇā by the hand after the precept, went into the middle of the platform, and spoke aloud with a thunder-deep voice these friendly, weighty, and most excellent words: 'Here are the bow, the mark, and the arrows. Let all the herders of the earth, here gathered, be pleased to hear me. Shoot with the five sharp arrows, whistling through the air, shoot the mark through the hole in the machine. Whoso accomplishes this great task, and is endowed with noble blood, a handsome figure, and strength, the wife of him will this my sister Kṛishṇā become to-day. I speak no lie.'"

Then he tells his sister the name and birth of the princes in a long, dry list,[1] and concludes: "These and many other kings of the various lands have come here for thy sake, my beloved, Kshattriyas that are famous on earth. These men of heroes' strength will for the sake of thee pierce the wonderful mark. Him that hits this mark, him O fair one, be pleased

[1] This whole chapter (186), whose çlokas are wedged right in among the trishṭubhs, so as to confuse the meaning, is probably a later tasteless intrusion. True, the Old Indians felt the barrenness of such an endless wilderness of names far less than we do, and 185.37, in the text as it is now, points to the following adhyāya. But this, too, is perhaps secondary. Anyhow, the old epic song or ballad poetry, too, naturally harboured good and bad.

to-day to choose for husband." "These highly-adorned youths, decked with ear-rings, the princes among men vying with one another, who believed in their own skill with the bow and their strength, all sprang up, brandishing their weapons. Afire with pride of beauty, heroism, nobility, good repute, wealth, and of youth, like unto Himālaya elephants in rut, and dripping from the fires of rut, looking at one another in the struggle for first place, with the fire of love running through their limbs—they spoke: 'Kṛishṇā is mine!' and rose swiftly from their princely seats."

Now they climbed like foes (although they were friends) on to the stage, with their burning hearts set on Draupadī. Gods, spirits, and Ṛishis came to the spectacle. "These kings, adorned with crown, necklets, and many bracelets, broad-armed, endowed with strength and stout heart, these kings, each in his turn, bellowing with might and heroism, could not even in thought put the string on to this fast-set bow. These princes, wishful to show their heroic strength, were flung away by the backward-springing stark bow, although theirs was practice, skill, and method; they sought to rise from the ground with all their might, and, forsaken by their strength, stripped of their crowns and necklets that were fallen down, and panting, they gave up. The ring of princes was now in torturing distress, they uttered anguished cries; owing to this strong bow their necklets and rows of bracelets had slipped off, and their yearning for Kṛishṇā was gone from them. When Karṇa thus saw all the kings, he, best among bow-drawers, went there, swiftly snatched up the bow from the ground, raised it and strung it, and set the arrows on it. So soon as the sons of Pāṇḍu, the bow-bearers, saw the Sūta (Karṇa), son of the sun, who had given a passionate promise (to accomplish the task), and excelled Agni, Soma, and the sun god, they deemed the splendid mark to be already pierced through and shot down onto the ground. But when Draupadī saw him, she spoke loud the words: 'I will choose no Sūta.' Looking up towards the sun with an angry laugh, Karṇa let drop the springing bow." [1]

[1] The following verses of this adhyāya, except, perhaps, the last one, are again a later forger's crime. K. of course did not let this

Then at length Arjuna rose up from amidst the Brahmans to accomplish the feat. To show their applause the Brahmans waved their skin garments, and made a mighty din. Some upbraided such a youth for undertaking what strong men had not been able to do, and feared that shame would thus fall on the whole caste of Brahmans. Others extolled his heroic appearance and bearing, and declared he would do everything he undertook, as indeed there was absolutely nought that was impossible to Brahmans, in spite of their seeming weakness. After several honorific ceremonies directed to the arrow and some of the high gods, Arjuna grasped the bow, strung it in the twinkling of an eye, took the five arrows, and pierced the mark. It fell onto the ground through the hole in the machine. A storm of applause was heard; thousands of Brahmans waved their garments, music and bardic praise broke forth. "When Kṛishṇā saw the target hit, she gazed at Pṛithā's son, him the Indra-like, and went, in her white robe and string of wreaths, with a proud smile to the son of Kuntī. He took her, whom he had won on the stage; and amidst honours from the Brahmans he left the stage, he the man of unimaginable deeds, accompanied by his wife. But when to him, a Brahman, the prince was about to give his daughter, rage welled up in the herders of the earth, as they looked at one another from near by. 'Putting us on one side and giving us no more heed than to a whisp of straw, he chooses to marry Draupadī, most glorious of women, to a Brahman. First a tree is planted here, then it is felled at the very time it should bear fruit. Let us slay this evil-minded one, who scorns us. . . . Has he then in this meeting of kings, that is like unto a gathering of the gods, seen no fitting prince? And the Brahmans, indeed, have no prescriptive right to be chosen. The Svayaṃvara is for the Kshattriyas. That is a

opportunity slip, either, to dish up still more of this unappetizing fare, and *in majorem gloriam Arjuni* even describes how also Karṇa in vain tries to draw the bow and is flung away (i, 202.34 ff.). Rādheya, at least, is, of course, also in B. 188.19 (K. 203.23)—a garbling, whether the fault lies with the Epic itself or with revisions, hostile to the Kurus, of the bardic songs. K. is at least quite consistent in leaving out altogether the beautiful passage with Karṇa drawing the bow.

holy tradition known to all.[1] Or if this maiden will have none of us, let her throw us into the fire, and let us go back to our kingdoms, ye rulers.'"

They now close in on Drupada, with arms in their hands. But Arjuna and Bhīma turn back and come into the lists on his behalf. Bhīma tears up a tree, and uses it as a club, while Arjuna makes his bow spit out arrows and destruction. The Brahmans wave their garments applaudingly, and their water-jugs, and promise Arjuna to fight by his side. But he only laughs and tells them to look on in comfort; he will drive back all his foes. Soon a deadly fight with the bow blazes up between Arjuna and Karṇa. The latter, greatly wondering, at last asks his opponent who he may be. He answers: "A Brahman." And the sun's son withdraws. In another part of the forest, meanwhile, Bhīma and Çalya, the king of the Madras, engaged in a raging fight with one another, wrestling and boxing, till Bhīma lifts his adversary up in his arms and flings him to the ground, but with his great soul spares his life. The two hero-brothers get away through the throng, while the band of princes sets out on the way home, and the princess follows the two into the potter's workshop to the mother of the Pāṇḍavas, who is hovering amidst a thousand anxieties as to what has become of her sons.

What is particularly noteworthy here is that the bride goes

[1] Hopkins makes this objection: In the beginning the Pāṇḍavas disguised as Brahmans are admitted without any question, and objection is only made when things go in their favour. But his deduction that therefore there is nothing of that warriors' privilege about the "self-choice", which deduction is based only on this case, is made too quickly, since anyhow the tale in question in its present shape aims at a glowing glorification of the priestly caste. Thus Drupada later on is anxious lest a Vaiçya or even a Çūdra may have won his daughter. But no one will assert that at the Svayaṃvara a man from so low a caste could have really been eligible. Dhṛishṭadyumna's proclamation that he who came from noble blood, was "of family" (kula), might be a wooer, is probably aimed at the Kshattriyas. Our tale, however, assumes that any kind of disguise, even that of a Çūdra as a Brahman, was quite natural at the Svayaṃvara—one of the many bits of nonsense in this patchwork piece of the Epic. Cp. too the singularities brought out in what follows.

off at once with her chosen man (i, 188.28 ; 190.41 ff. ; 191 ; 192 ; 193.4, 6). In the brother's lodging she is then treated by Kuntī at once as the wife of her sons ; she shares out the alms they bring home, and sleeps at the foot of the Pāṇḍavas. The father of the bride meanwhile is trembling with deadly anxiety ; for he does not know whether even a Vaiçya or a Çūdra may not have won his daughter, and so he himself been disgraced for all time. But his son Dhṛishṭadyumna has followed the two as they secretly went off, overhears them in the potter's workshop, and listens how they speak only of battles, arms, chariots, and elephants, and so can bring joyful news to his waiting sire. The house priest is sent off to the brothers to learn more particulars, and then a messenger bidding them to the feast. Outside before the abode of the Pāṇḍavas the most splendid chariots are waiting. They all enter, and drive to the royal palace. Kuntī goes with Draupadī to the womenfolk. Meanwhile the sons of Pāṇḍu are put to a further trial : tools and implements and things needed in the various callings have been brought together, but the heroes go by everything and straight on to the arms.[1] Lastly Drupada has another conversation with Yudhishṭhira, and asks him who he is, whether he is a warrior or a Brahman, a Vaiçya or a Çūdra, and now learns they are really the sons of Pāṇḍu, as he has so longed for. Draupadī is again lodged in one house with the five brothers, just as though she were already given in marriage, and after the difficulty has been met which is found in the planned polyandric marriage of the princess, she is then entrusted on each of five days one after the other to one of the Pāṇḍavas.

Just like this one is the trial in the Rāmāyaṇa (i, 66, 67). Janaka, the king of Videha, possesses the wonderful bow of Çiva, and a daughter Sītā, alone in her kind, who came forth at the ploughing, out of the furrow under the plough ; and this maiden born from no mother's womb he promises as vīryaçulkā to the strong man that can lift the huge bow, and string and draw it. Kings come in throngs and seek Sītā's hand, but none can fulfil the condition. Filled with anger they besiege

[1] Cp. my note 3, p. xlvii of the Samayamātṛikā and Prabandhacintāmani (Tawney), p. 7.

Mithilā, the royal city, but Janaka, who at the end of a year finds himself at the end of his resources, wins the favour of the gods by ascetic deeds ; they give him an army and the kings have to withdraw in shame. Then later the youthful Rāma comes with his brother and the royal Ṛishi Viçvāmitra to Janaka, and asks him to have the bow brought. A hundred and fifty men drag up an iron chest fitted with eight wheels, wherein the bow, marked out by the people with divine honours, lies. Rāma lifts it out as though in play, strings it, and draws it, whereon the bow breaks in two in the middle, and with such a crash that the earth quakes, and all the people, excepting the king, the two youths, and Viçvāmitra, fall swooning on the ground. Then Sītā is wedded to Rāma.

Even a fight, as a very primitive method, also gives the decision in MBh., vii, 144.9 ff. : " At this very time, at the Svayaṃvara of the daughter of the great souled Devaka, for which all the Kshattriyas gathered together, at this time of a truth Çini overcame all the princes, and lifted the queen Devakī swiftly onto his chariot for Vasudeva (to whom he then brought her). When the hero, Somadatta, the bull among men, saw Devakī on his chariot, the so mighty one could not bear this with calm. Through half a day the glorious, wonderful fight between the two lasted, a fight with fists was fought between the two strong ones.[1] But Çini flung Somadatta violently on the ground, lifted his sword, grasped him by the hair, and kicked him with his foot in the midst of the thousands of kings watching from every side. But, pitying, he spoke : ' Live ! ' and set him free again." Cp. further iii, 12.31, 115 ; vii, 11.10 f.

In face of the express declaration of the Kshattriyas that the Svayaṃvara is their peculiar right, it sounds almost like a clumsy pretention of the priestly caste when in v, 35, we find this tale : " Engaged on the Svayaṃvara was the maiden called Keçinī, incomparable in her loveliness, yearning she was for a right goodly husband. Then the Daitya Virocana came thither, wishing to win her. Then spoke Keçinī there to the Daitya prince : ' Are the Brahmans the better, or the

[1] Read : subalinoḥ.

children of Diti?'" But Virocana spoke scornfully of gods and Brahmans. Yet in the end he had to bring himself to wash a Brahman's feet under the fair one's eyes.

In the so-called self-choice, therefore, the maiden has either no freedom whatever, or else only a restricted one. We meet with a less splendid, but much more beautiful form in the Svayaṃvara of Sāvitrī, who wanders about looking and seeking until her heart picks one out. But here likewise it is done at her father's instigation. It is with an unusual meaning, therefore, that the word is made use of in Rām., i, 32. The king Kuçanābha has a hundred daughters. "Now in the bloom of youth, with the gift of beauty, fair-decked, they went into the park, like autumn lightning, singing, dancing, and playing musical instruments. They, the maidens dight with splendid ornaments, found the greatest joy. Then the god of the wind saw them, and spoke. 'I love you, do ye all become my wives. Leave the abode and ways of mankind, and ye shall then win long life. For youth is always fleeting, especially in mankind. When ye have reached to a youth beyond harming, ye will become immortal.' But they laughed at him, and cried: 'May the time not come, O fool, when we, scorning our truth-speaking father, make use of self-choice after our own will. He to whom our father gives us shall be our husband.'" Here svayaṃvara = svayaṃgrahaṇa, the independent self-willed union of the maiden with the man. This is one of the dreadful happenings that come about before the end of a world. Thus we read in Mahābh., iii, 190.36: "No man any longer asks for the daughter, nor is the daughter given away; they take the man for themselves, when the end of the world (yugānta) is drawn nigh."

Yet this very independence of the girl is of the essence of the Gandharva marriage, which is also part of the orthodox system. It is likewise only a concern of the warrior, as we have already seen (i, 102.16; xiii, 44.5 f.). And for him it is even the best of the forms, as Dushyanta declares (i, 73.4), who, it is true, is in love, and bent on his purpose—to ensnare the maiden. Indeed, in i, 172.19 it is called the best of any forms, although here again it is a man fired with passion that is speaking to his adored one, even if it is not with so great success as

Dushyanta.[1] This king's Gandharva marriage with Çakuntalā, which is well-known especially through Kālidāsa's drama, is a celebrated example (i, 68 ff.).

That pattern prince Dushyanta, under whom men led a paradise-like life, went forth one day to hunt, "and him in his towering kingly splendour the wives of this hero beheld there, as they stood on the palace battlements, him that won fame for himself, was like the prince of the gods, destroyed his foes and kept off their elephants. As the band of women gazed on him there, they held him for the wielder of the thunderbolt: 'That is the tiger among men, like unto the Vasus for heroism in the fight. When the foemen's host comes under his strong arm, then it is all over with them.' With words such as these did the women in their love praise

[1] The Gandharva form is only for the warrior nobility according likewise to Manu, iii, 26; Vishṇu, xxiv, 28 (and he that so gives his daughter away, thereby comes into the blessed worlds of the Gandharvas, 37). On the other hand Baudhāyana, i, 11, 20.13, teaches that the Gandharva marriage is lawful for the Vaiçya and the Çūdra, but according to "others" for all castes, and that because it is based on love. Baudh. himself, however, evidently thinks that maidens who make so free are not of much value after all (see 14 and 15). Nārada states without hesitation that this kind of marriage belongs to all castes alike (sādhāraṇa), while he roundly rejects capture marriage as also marriage by purchase and by fraud (xii, 44). Moreover the holy Kaṇva (MBh., i, 73.27) is also in agreement: "The Gandharva form is according to tradition the best for the Kshattriya." If the current view of the ethnologists and anthropologists were really the right one—that marriage has grown all over the world out of "hetærism" (and it has much to be said for it)—then the Indian views as to the Gandharva home-bringing, that "survival from the time of promiscuity", might very well be understood from an "inter-ethnic" standpoint, and even a speculative theory built up on the bare names: on this theory the Gandharvas, the owners of the woman before marriage, would be the symbols of the whole clan or tribal community, every male member of which had a right to all the women, and so on. But such things may be left to others. Moreover there is still found to-day among very many tribes of the primitive population of India not only an exceedingly loose sexual life, but also marriage according to the free will of the two most concerned. So the "Gandharva marriage" thus thrust itself on the Aryan settlers.

the overlord of men, and scatter a rain of flowers on his head."

A dreadful slaughter did he deal out among the beasts of the wild, and hungry, thirsty, and weary he came into a forest swept through by a cool wind. It was covered with a right pleasant sward, was far-stretched, and made musical by surpassingly sweet-singing birds, and swarms of cicadas. Trees with mighty boughs and grateful shade filled it; the leaves[1] quivered under the bees. There was no tree there but bore flowers and fruits, or that bristled with thorns, nor one but was covered with bees. The wind rocked the trees to and fro so that they kept on showering down a many-coloured rain of flowers. Up to the skies rose these forest giants resounding with sweet bird-song, but their boughs bent low under the burden of the flowers. Bough twined lovingly with bough. Spirit beings wandered through the forest, and the cool wind was wafted about it, sweet-smelling, carrying off the pollen from the flowers, and drew nigh the trees, as though minded to sport in love with them. And in the midst of this forest paradise there the king saw an incomparable penitent's grove, like the world of the gods to behold. A splendid, cool, and mighty stream clasped this settlement like a mother, abounding in sandbanks with loving couples of cakravāka, carrying flowers[2] along like foam. Wonderful as this whole forest was this abode of ascetics, throughout which holy men were giving themselves up to good works, and where, as in Indra's heaven, hunger and thirst at once were lifted from the king, while welling joy filled his heart. He wished to visit the holy Kaṇva, the head of the forest brethren, but found him not, but found a young girl in penitent's garb, who came to meet him, on his calling, like the embodied goddess of beauty and happiness. She gave him friendly welcome and showed him the honours of hospitality. On his asking where Kaṇva was, she answered: "My father, the holy man, has gone forth from the hermitage to get fruit. Wait a moment, and thou wilt see him." The king was filled with great wonder at

[1] Is -dalam to be read instead of -talam in 70.6? The meaning is essentially the same in either case.

[2] Or: flowers and foam.

her beauty, and moral excellence, and spoke : "Who art thou, and whose daughter, thou with the lovely hips ? Wherefore art thou come into the forest ? Whence is thy descent, thou that art gifted with such beauty ? At the sight of thee only, thou hast taken my heart from me. I would fain come to know thee ; therefore tell me, thou shining one." She told him she was Kaṇva's daughter. But the prince answered : "The holy man is held in honour in the world as a keeper of strictest chastity. Even the god of virtue might fall from good ways, but not this man of the strict vow. How then art thou his daughter ?" Çakuntalā now told him how the gods had sent the Apsaras Menakā to lead that dangerous penitent astray, the king Viçvāmitra, and how she was sprung from this union, had been exposed by her mother, and had been brought up by Kaṇva as his own daughter. Dushyanta spoke : "Quite clearly thou art a prince's daughter, after what thou sayest, sweet one. Be my wife, thou of the lovely hips. Say, what can I do for thee ? Now will I bring thee a golden wreath, garments, ear-rings, all of gold, gleaming jewels and pearls from various cities, and breast-ornaments and skins too. The whole kingdom shall be thine now. Be my wife, O shining one. Come to me through the Gandharva marriage, O lovely one ; for of marriages that of the Gandharvas is declared to be the best, O maiden with thighs like plantain-stems." Çakuntalā spoke : "My father has left this hermitage to fetch fruit ; wait a moment, O king, then he will give me to thee." Dushyanta spoke : "I wish thee, O lovely-hipped one, thee that art without blemish, to give thyself to me in love. Know thou, it is for thy sake that I am at all, for it is on thee that my mind is bent. Only self is akin to self, and only self is the refuge of self. May thou thyself according to law and justice give me thine own self.[1] Eight

[1] As times beyond number in the world's literature, so too in Indian literature, and especially in the MBh. over and over again is heard the partly painful, partly fierily energetic cry : "Each is alone." None belongs to anyone else, we are all but strangers to strangers, utterly cut off even from the dearest and nearest ; none knows the other, the self belongs only to the self. Man is born alone, alone he lives, alone he dies, alone he tastes the fruit of his deeds and his ways ; it is only

forms of marriage, to speak shortly, have been handed down in law and custom : that of Brahman, that of the gods, as

his work that bears him company. As night is the mother of things, so too we come out of the darkness and go into the darkness, come forth out of nothingness, and go through a short being into nothingness (cp. Agnipurāṇa, 119.13b, taken from Vishṇu, xx, 48); just as little as the tree knows of its flowers and fruits, does man know of whence he comes and whither he goes. Our bodily and spiritual organism is ever changing ; what belongs, then, to us ? Even our body, our sense perceptions, thoughts and feelings are not ours, are only products of the ever-flowing matter. Thus, too, there is really no teacher or leader for anyone, each is his own Guru and must go along the road to happiness alone. Only the self is the friend, only the self is the foe of man ; from others nothing comes to him. Therefore what must be is to honour, to assert the self, to be quite true, never to lie either in word or deed. Self-culture, however, is found in self-discipline. Indeed, he who of his own will renounces all (and only lives in others), he who then really knows and feels that nothing belongs to him, to him everything belongs. But as opposed to this most lofty ethical teaching there is deduced from the saying : " Each is alone, and each is akin only and utterly to himself " the most thoroughgoing egoism or individualism, and the teaching is always being stressed : For the sake of self we must give up everything, even the nearest and dearest, it is only to self that we owe any regard. And : He that wants greatness must be cruel ; moral virtue (dharma) has been put in the way of the strong by the weak. It is perhaps worthy of note that the Buddhists call this " the wisdom of the Kshattriyas " (cp. my Daçakumārac., p. 109). But here the thought of the Indian " Mirrors of Princes " may have played a very great part. See, for instance, i, 140, especially 140.77 (= xii, 140.50); 158.27 ff.; iii, 159.14 ; 215.27, 28 ; v, 33.74; 34.64, 65 ; 37.18 ; vi, 30.5 f. ; x, 1.24 ; xi, 2.6 ; 2.13 (almost = xii, 174.17 and xv, 34.17) ; xii, 139.30 ; 140.5 ; 275.35 ; 288.16 ff. ; 318.104 ; 320.115 ff. ; 321.85, 86 ; 329.32 ff. ; xiii, 111.9 ff. ; xv, 34.17. Cp. my Kauṭilya, p. lx. Many of these thoughts are also often uttered by the Buddhists and the Jains. So Majjh.-Nik., i, 136 ; Mahāvagga, i, 6.38 ff., etc. The Jain monk Amitagati is ready at hand in Subhāshitasaṃdoha, ii, 16, with a Sanskrit model for the celebrated saying of Hans the Stone-breaker in Anzengruber's *Kreuzelschreiber* : Anyajano na kiṃcic chaknoti kartum (" nothing can happen to thee "). Cp. my Daçakumārac., note 1, pp. 110 ; 362, and *Hindu Tales*, p. 153, where indeed the quotations could be multiplied to infinity.

also that of the Ṛishis, that of Prajāpati, and that of the Asuras, that of the Gandharvas and that of the Rākshasas ; that of the Piçācas is according to tradition the eighth. The good among these Manu has explained by turns. Hold it for truth that the four first are praiseworthy among the Brahmans, and know, O faultless one, that six in turn are deemed lawful for the Kshattriya man. For kings the Rākshasa marriage, too, is commended, and for the Vaiçya and Çūdra that of the Asuras is traditional. Of five three here are lawful, and two unlawful, according to the tradition. The Piçāca marriage and the Asura marriage must never be made. In this way it is that the marriage must be carried out, this is the way of the law according to the tradition. Gandharva and Rākshasa marriages are lawful for the Kshattriya man, have no mistrust about them ; he may enter upon them, whether they are among others or not, of that is no doubt. Be thou a wife to me, as loving woman to loving man, according to the Gandharva marriage, thou of the lovely face." Çakuntalā spoke : " If this is the path of the law, and I myself have the power to give myself away, O best of the Pūru race, then hear my condition, O lord. Promise me the holy truth, just as I tell it thee in secret : The son that is born of me must be the next after thee, the crown prince, O great king ; this I demand as a sacred thing from thee. If so it shall be, O Dushyanta, then let my union with thee come about." " Thus shall it be," said the king to her, without stopping to think, " and I will also take thee into my city, O bright-smiling one, as thou dost deserve, fair-hipped one, that I swear to thee." After these words the royal Ṛishi, according to the holy precept (vidhivat), took by the hand her of the faultless gait, and lay with her. And when he had consoled her, he went away, and spoke over and over again : " I shall send an army in four parts for thee, and have thee brought by it unto my abode, O bright-smiling one." Having made her this promise, the prince went off, thinking in his mind of Kaṇva : " What will he do, the holy man, endowed with asceticism, when he hears of it ? " With these thoughts only did he come into the city. When he had only been gone a moment Kaṇva came into the penitent's grove. But Çakuntalā from shame did not go to meet her

father. Then the great penitent, endowed with godlike knowledge, knew how it was with her, and the holy one joyfully spoke: "The union, O kindly one, which to-day thou didst carry out with a man in secret without regard for me, does no harm to law and virtue. For the Gandharva marriage is deemed the best for the Kshattriya man, which is made in secret between two lovers without holy words, as the tradition teaches us. Filled with righteousness, and lofty-souled is Dushyanta, best among men, to whom thou hast drawn nigh as to thy husband, the lover, O Çakuntalā.[1] From thee a noble-souled son will be born into the world, who will rule over this whole sea-girdled earth." She now begged the holy man for a blessing for her husband, which, too, was granted her.

The Gandharva marriage was thus a right of lords, a part of the morality of lords, and certainly not seldom found among the nobility. For the Brahmanic outlook it naturally seemed offensive, but the crafty priest all over the world, and above all in India, has from shrewdness often kept an eye shut, and the thirst for systematization, as also the pious respect for all tradition, brought down this part of the marriage theory, too, into late times, where in the narrative literature Gandharva weddings are extraordinarily frequent. But it is not altogether "free love affairs", as has been thought, that are here to be generally understood by this; for however light-heartedly such a union is often entered upon there, it is mostly held to be binding. True, exceptions are to be found, just as here the old holy King Dushyanta looks on his adventure with the penitent-maiden as the forest tale of a fleeting hour, and as a result our story develops a long train of effects.

In spite of all the promises Çakuntalā never heard another word from her husband; her son came into the world, and from childhood's years stood forth as a miracle of strength, courage, and noble fierceness: tigers, elephants, and other dangerous beasts he bound to trees, when he was six years old, bestrode them, and rode about on them. Then spoke the holy man: "To dwell long with kinsfolk does not befit women, for it destroys the good name, seemly life, and

[1] Read yaṃ instead of yas. K. 94.62 has however: abhyāgacchat patir yas tvāṃ bhajamānāṃ.

virtue." [1] And he sent away his daughter and the boy, accompanied by his disciples, to the king, that his, the king's scion, might be consecrated as crown prince. Çakuntalā presented his son to the ruler, and reminded him of the promise he had given her. But although the prince well remembered all, he said: "I do not remember. To whom then dost thou belong, thou shameless penitent? I know of no union with thee, whether in pious duty, or in love, or in profit. Go, or stay here, as thou wilt; whatever thou wishest, do it." "Thus addressed, she of the lovely hips stood there as one put to shame, the wretched one, as though senseless for sorrow, like a motionless tree-stump. With eyes reddened with emotion and indignation, with quivering lips, scorching him, as it were, with stolen glances, she gazed at him sideways. With features drawn, and goaded on by anger, she withheld her fiery powers heaped up through her mortifications. Having pondered a moment, filled with anguish and indignation, she looked at her husband, and angrily spoke the words: 'Why speakest thou, O great king, though thou knowest it, without scruple like any ordinary man: I do not know about it? Thine heart knows here of truth and falsehood. Do thou speak what is fitting and good as an impartial witness; do not scorn thine own self. He that forces his own self otherwise than it is made, what a crime has he not committed, he the thief robbing his own self! [2]

"I am alone," so thy thoughts go
And thou in thy heart knowest not the old Muni,
Who in it knows the evil doing;
Before his face thou workest crooked falsehood.

"None knows me," this is the illusion
Of the man that has done evil.
Him the God knows, enthroned above,
And the Man, too, knows, dwelling in the heart.

[1] Cp. Mārkaṇḍeyapur., lxxvii, 19.

[2] Ātmāpahārin is explained by Nīl. in vii, 73.33 as ātmānam anyathā prakāçayan. Cp. v, 42.37; vii, 17.32.

The sun and moon, the wind, fire,
Earth, heaven, water, Yama, and his heart also,
Day, night, the two twilights,
The law—they know here man's life.[1]

Yama absolves him from evil done
Who is a joy of the witness to deeds,
Of the mind, to which the field is known,
And which dwells there in our breast.[2]

But the man that is hateful to him,
Because evil-minded he doth evil
And busied is with ill deeds,
Him Yama some day punishes with a burden of torment.

He that himself scorning his own self does
To himself what is not after the heart of the self,
And sees not[3] the ground of action in the self,
To him, too, no gods are kind.

Do not thus scorn me, that am true to my husband, saying that I have come hither on my own impulse. Me thou dost not honour, who am worthy of honour, who am the wife that drew near unto thee thyself. Why dost thou treat me with disdain before the assembly, like a man of low birth? And I am not calling this out in the wilderness. Why dost thou not hear me?' "

Then from her lips comes a splendid song of praise for family happiness (a rendering of part of which will be given later), and she ends with a lament that her mother had already forsaken her as a child, and now her husband was repudiating her, and she was in the world with no kinsfolk. But the king upbraids her as a bad woman, sneers at her declaration that she is Viçvāmitra's daughter, and jeeringly says that her evil-living mother, Menakā, has picked her up, the evil-living

[1] Cp. Garuḍapurāṇasāroddhāra, iii, 16.

[2] Niryātayati dushkṛitam removes, forgives the evil deed, the sin. In the following çloka the literal translation is perhaps: the evil-doer he makes to taste his sins, he punishes in him the evil deed (thus not from dushkṛit).

[3] Or: "In whose self happiness does not lie." So, too, Nīl.

daughter, somewhere else. "All whereof thou speakest is unknown to me; I know thee not; go thy ways, wherever thou chooseſt." Majeſtically Çakuntalā speaks:

> "The fault of others thou seeſt large,
> That are small as a grain of sesame;
> Thine own, great as bilva fruits,
> Are not bared to thy seeing eye.

Menakā is with the gods, and the gods are with Menakā. My descent is higher than thine, Dushyanta. Thou wandereſt along on earth, I through the air. So long as the ugly man does not see his own face in the glass, he believes he is handsomer than others. He that has the gift of the higheſt beauty scorns no one. But he that utters a ſtream of immeasurably evil words is an outrage here on earth." Then she opposes, in their nature and ways, the foolish and the bad to the wise and the good, with a telling reference to Dushyanta with his evil and unwise deeds, and winds up with an inspired song, full of fire, on the truth that is so sorely sinned againſt by the man of deceit. "Better than a hundred wells is the tank, better than a hundred tanks the sacrifice, better than a hundred sacrifices the son, better than a hundred sons the truth. If a thousand sacrificial ſteeds and the truth are put on the balance, then the truth outweighs even the thousand sacrificial ſteeds. To ſtudy all the Vedas, to bathe at all the holy bathing-places, and the truth—these things are on an equality with one another, nay, the truth ſtands higher. King, truth is the higheſt "Brahman", truth is the higheſt duty; do not forsake duty, O king, let truth be thy bosom companion. If thou, however, clingeſt to the lie, if thou doſt not believe from thine own impulse, then I will go of my own self; with one such as thou there is no friendly relation." Then a voice sounds from the sky, assuring the king that this is his son, and bidding him to take him to himself. Then Dushyanta declares to his miniſters and prieſts that he was not allowed to avow his son otherwise, else would the world have doubted the truth of his descent, and to Çakuntalā he speaks: "Our union took place hidden from the world; to cleanse thee, O queen, it was that I have so delayed and teſted thee. But what harsh things

thou hast uttered to me in anger over-great, my love, they are forgiven thee by me because of thy tender affection." He yields her honour now as his head-wife, kisses and clasps his son, and dedicates him as crown prince.[1]

[1] K. has spun the Çakuntalā episode far out, and in part botched it very tastelessly. How wonderfully did the author of this poetic pearl of the MBh. make the innocent forest maid answer the king when he first bids her to give herself to him! Instead of this one verse, wholly to the point and almost literally repeating the words spoken by her in another connection, the southern botchwork puts a long speech on the awfulness of the holy ones and the Brahmans into the good child's mouth, as also moral reflections on father, daughter, and wife (çl. 94.6 = Rām., i, 32.22). She is then so cunning, too, in her fear of what the world says, as to demand first of all a solemn marriage with all the ceremonies of the law. And the love-goaded king now calls to his Purohita, and has himself married to her by him! When Kaṇva comes home, Çakuntalā dares not face him, but he gets her to tell what has happened to her, which, of course, is done here *sagadgadam*, and he then magnificently announces that he knew it at once through his "godlike eye", but consoles her, and says:

Ṛitavo bahavas te vai
gatā vyarthāḥ, çucismite;
sārthakaṃ sāmprataṃ hy etan,
na ca pāpmāśti te, 'naghe.

Her son Bharata shows himself even in childhood's years to be a mighty demon-slayer, like unto his father in Kālidāsa. Then Çakuntalā's sorrow when she leaves the hermitage is drawn in very broad and really beautiful lines, but not, it is to be noted, in the tone of the epic poet, but lyrically like Kālidāsa, or even a little stronger, although with less flowerlike-delicacy than in the drama; she wants and does not want to go forth, while the boy urges her and Kaṇva gives her wise instructions despite his tears. The penitents who are going with her as escort do not wish to go into the nagaraṃ durjanair vṛitaṃ, particularly since many of the townsmen jeer at them, and go back home from the gates, as Kaṇva has bidden them. Çakuntalā amid the ecstatic and Indian-like descriptive admiration, called forth in the townsmen by her beauty and Bharata's sturdy strength, proceeds alone through the city to the palace. Her discussion with the king is also a good deal longer, and not only are a lot of very good sayings added, but also lyric and effective touches. Thus in describing her origin and how she was exposed Çakuntalā draws a picture of how the birds covered the

Beside such romantic love and marriage adventures of the Kshattriyas the marriage by purchase, established from olden times among the mass of the people, could not naturally but seem vulgar and low. So we already saw it described, in agreement with the Smṛiti, and it is often brought up as a dreadful sin. So vii, 43.37 ; 73.42 ; xiii, 93.133 ; 94.31. But it was not at all confined to the *misera plebs*, nor is it still in India to-day.[1] In one case, however, we are expressly

little child with their wings and then had solemnly handed it over to Kaṇva (98.70 ff., cp. 93.20–24), how he had brought her up, and the prince had found the blossoming maid and made her his (98.70 ff.). Instead of the one voice from the sky sarvāṇi bhūtāni and the devās also take a part. Dushyanta, so forgiving and great-souled towards the angry woman, here, showing great reasonableness, goes on to say : " The untrue or unkind words I have spoken, or the but too great evil I have done, my ill words, all these do thou, too, forgive me, thou great-eyed one. Through patience with their husband wives are granted the husband's faithfulness." He leads her ceremoniously into his harem as head-wife, and to his mother Rathantarī.

[1] When the ape in the 219th Jātaka (which I have edited in my *Kāvyasaṃgraha, Metrische Übersetzungen aus indischen und andern Sprachen*) comes back again to his brethren in the forest, he tells them, as characteristic of the topsy-turvy world of men, how wives are bought in it for much money. Many such instances could be quoted. From the law literature, too, it comes out more or less incidentally in many places that marriage by purchase was the general thing. Manu, for instance, is very hard against purchase marriage (iii, 25 ; 51–54 ; ix, 98–100) ; and yet in ix, 93 and viii, 366 the bride-price for the daughter appears as the father's natural right. Other passages are given by Bühler in his translation of this law-book, p. xciii. Baudhāyana, i, 11, 21.1–3 and ii, 2.27 paints the sinfulness of such a proceeding in vivid colours, but grants in i, 11, 20.12 that it is lawful, at least for the Kshattriya. Nārada in xii, 54, even thunders : Only the husband of the unbought woman is a real husband and owner ; if a price has been given for a woman, then the children begotten by another man belong to the wife ; not to the husband, but to the lover. But the earlier quoted passage in xii, 30, shows, however, that the " maiden for whom a bride-price (çulka) has been given " has the same meaning with him also as the " betrothed ". Indeed, Vasishtha, i, 36, has instead of Āsura simply Mānusha " the way of bringing home with mankind ". Cp. 36 and 37 and Bühler's note on it in *Sacred Books*

told that shame was felt towards it in the upper classes. "Then Bhīshma, Çāntanu's son, he the thinker, bent his mind on a second marriage for the king Pāṇḍu, the glorious. With the old ministers and with Brahmans, great holy men and an army in four divisions he made his way to the city of the king of the Madras. When the leader of the Vāhīkas heard he had come, the prince went to meet him and brought him into the city. When the ruler of Madra had set before him a splendid seat and water for the feet, as also the honorific guest-water and the honey-mixture, he asked about the object of his coming. To the Madra king spoke Bhīshma, the Kuru offspring: 'Know that I have come to request a maiden, O tamer of foes. It is said thou hast a surpassing sister, Mādrī, the glorious one. I would ask for her for Pāṇḍu. For thou art fitting unto us for an alliance, and we to thee. Bearing this in mind, O prince of the Madras, accept us, as is right and seemly.' To Bhīshma, thus speaking, made answer the warden of the Madras: 'For me there is no better wooer than he,[1] that I hold. By my forefathers, the greatest men in this family, something was introduced; now whether it be good or bad, I cannot set myself above it. It is known to all and also to thee, of that is no doubt. It is indeed, not becoming to say: Lord, give.[2] That is the wont and custom of our family, and this is our main guiding-thread. Therefore do I speak unto

of the East, xiv, p. 7. According to Mānavagrihyas., i, 7–8, there are only two kinds of marriage: brāhma and çaulka. As a direct contrast to the Brahmanic view, which in the Mahānirvāṇatantra, xi, 84 even demands that the king shall drive out of the land, as godless and fallen, the man that gives away his daughter for money, let it be mentioned that among our old Germanic forbears the free gift of the bride was invalid, and only the purchase marriage was valid in law (Sohm, *Deutsche Rundschau*, 1878, p. 99; Westermarck [3], p. 429 f.).

[1] According to K.: "than thou" (i, 122.8, that is, tvattaḥ instead of tvataḥ).

[2] Bhavān dehi. The difficulty would be done away with, if we read yuktas for yuktaṃ (iii, 115.24). But like constructions are found elsewhere in the Epic. In the next çloka I read ca for na. If na is kept, then: therefore, it is, that the words I speak unto thee are not without a clause (or reservation).

thee these clear open words, O slayer of foes.' To the Madra king made answer Bhīshma, overlord of men : 'This law is the highest, O king, proclaimed by Brahma himself. There lies nothing of evil in it. The forefathers made this rule. And well-known, O Çalya, is this prescription, approved by the good, and laid upon thee.' [1] After these words the very mighty one gave wrought and unwrought gold, and many kinds of jewels in thousands ; elephants, horses and chariots, apparel and ornaments, precious stones, pearls and coral, that shone, did the son of Gaṇgā bestow. All this did Çalya take with joyous heart, and gave him his sister for it, having decked her out. Bhīshma, the son of her that wanders unto the sea, took Mādrī, and went off with her to Hāstinapura. When then a fitting day and moment was come, approved by the excellent ones, King Pāṇḍu took hold of Mādrī's hand according to the holy prescript (i, 113, 1 ff.)."

iii, 115.20 ff. is quite the same, a passage with a rather ancient look about it. In Kanyākubja was a great and very mighty prince, famous under the name of Gādhi ; he went off to live in the forest. But while he was living in the forest a daughter was born to him, like an Apsaras. Ṛicīka, the offspring of Bhṛigu, sought her in marriage. To him, the Brahman of unbending piety, Gādhi then spoke : " In our family a thing is customary which our forefathers brought in.

[1] Bhīshma here speaks as a true Indian: what is traditional, the custom of the fathers, is holy. Ask a Hindu why he follows this custom or that, and he will immediately say that his father taught him to do so and that it was handed down to him from time immemorial. Rāmakrishṇa, *Life in an Indian Village*, London, 1891, p. 27. So, too, Dubois, *Hindu Manners*, etc., [3], p. 100. Whether the buying of a wife is in itself bad or good is left undiscussed withal. In different parts, or even families in India there prevailed in olden times, and still prevail to-day, very varying customs and laws. Moreover, as is well known, the Indus populations have never fitted themselves to unbending Brahmanism, and were therefore held in ill repute; and that the Madras, Vāhikas, etc. under Çalya's rule were held not to be ethically polished is to be seen easily from Karṇa's scornful scandalous chronicle of these, at least so-called, moral barbarians (vii, 40 ff.). But anyhow Bhīshma does not hesitate to take part in this business as the buyer.

A thousand fiery white steeds, each with one black ear [1] is the purchase price. Know this, O best of the Brahmans. And yet I may not say to thee, the holy one: 'Give,' O offspring of Bhṛigu. Yet must I give my daughter to a noble-natured one like thee." Ṛicīka promised him the steeds, and got them from Varuṇa, who made them to come up out of the water. The place where it happened is the famous horse-tīrtha on the Gaṅgā in Kanyākubja. The holy man delivered over the precious race-horses to the father, who gave him his daughter in marriage, and the gods themselves were groomsmen. All this was done dharmeṇa (according to the law).[2] These thousand wonderful horses were then given by Gādhi to the priests, and six hundred of them play a great part in the tale of Gālava and Mādhavī, which also belongs here, and has already been given.

In xiii, 2.18 the ideal king Duryodhana of the race of Manu and Ikshvāku bestows his daughter in marriage on Agni, and demands instead of the purchase price (çulka) the continual presence of the fire god. But it may be that rather we have here a turn of speech.[3] But it does not at all fall naturally under the conception of the çulka, when the fisherman Dāça gives his adopted daughter Satyavatī as wife to the enamoured king Çāntanu only under the condition that her son shall be definitely king (i, 100).

As we have now seen, it does indeed happen that a mythical king may marry a Brahman maiden, even if it is not without preliminary scruples because of his own unworthiness. But the Indian dislike which runs so strongly against dragging down the woman by marriage into a lower caste has here

[1] Or: with ears black on one side. So Nīl.

[2] Cp. Bhāgavatapurāṇa, ix, 15; Vishṇupurāṇa, iv, 7 (Wilson, vol. 4, pp. 13 ff.).

[3] But it would seem seriously meant in the case of Citrāṅgadā, the daughter of the king in Maṇipūra. The father demands, and Arjuna grants him the only son that is possible of the marriage instead of the purchase price (i, 215.25; 217.25). In this family after Çiva's ordinance only one child is ever born, and the present king has a daughter.

borne down almoſt everything before it,[1] and the Kshattriya wants a Kshattriya maiden, as Dushyanta shows. Cp. also xii, 320.59. It is true that in xii, 123.21 marriage into a holy family is prescribed as an atonement (cp. xii, 134.2) for the king who has done wrong. But whether by the mahākula a Brahmanic one is meant cannot be said for certain, but seems here to be necessary. On the other hand, in consonance with the orthodox teaching, Brahmans very often unite in the Epic with daughters of Kshattriyas. But here also, as elsewhere in the Mahābh., we meet with the traces of a more primitive view, and one less flattering to the pride of the prieſt, among the ruling caſte. To the king Duryodhana, juſt mentioned, Agni comes firſt in the figure of a Brahman, and seeks the Kshattriya child in marriage. But, "Poor he is and not of my caſte," so said the king, and would not give his daughter to the Brahman. In xiii, 4 we find a variant of the tale of the thousand wonderful horses. There we learn that why Gādhi had withdrawn into the foreſt was because he wished to win offspring by penance. There a daughter was born to him, the incomparably lovely Satyavatī; she was desired by the Brahman Ṛicīka of the greatly famous family of the Bhṛigus. But Gādhi, crusher of foes, did not give her to the high-souled Ṛicīka; for he thought within himself: "He is poor." When the wooer came back again after his rejection, the beſt among kings spoke to him: "Give me the purchase price, then thou wilt obtain (vatsyasi [2]) my daughter." Ṛicīka spoke: "What shall I give thee as price for thy daughter, O prince of kings? Speak without hesitation. Let no reluctance be there." Then Gādhi demanded the thousand horses, gleaming like the moonbeam, swift as the

[1] It is to be noted, too, that King Yayāti, who is moreover called a "Ṛishi" and "Ṛishi's son", wins the Brahman's daughter Devayānī because she has had the curse laid on her that no Brahman shall wed her. But in the tale there can be heard the clear note of the caſte pride of the prieſt, often sorely humbled by the nobility. So probably that curse was purposely invented into the bargain.

[2] Vasati with acc. "to have to look forward to, to fall into something, to experience, to obtain" is also found elsewhere in the Epic. Cp. v, 35.30; Rām., iv, 20.17.

wind, black in one ear; and the Brahman got them from Varuṇa, who brought them up from below the Gaṅgā at the very place the suppliant wished. Gādhi was astonished unto death, for he had naturally by his demand only wanted to be rid of the unwished for man, but he was afraid of the holy one's curse, and gave him his daughter for this payment. "And when she had got such a husband, she was taken with the greatest joy."

But it is not only the caste which must be looked to in marriage, but the younger brother must not marry before the elder, nor the younger sister before one that is above her in years, an offence of which, indeed, the law books often speak. In the case of such an offence all three (the two brothers and the wife) according to xii, 165.68,69 must, since they have lost their caste through this wrongdoing, undertake the Cāndrāyaṇa or the Kṛicchra mortification to be freed from their sin. On the other hand, xii, 35.27, 28 lays down an atonement only for the two brothers, and that only a twelve days' Kṛicchra vow; but the younger brother must marry a second time (niveçyaṃ tu punas tena sadā tārayatā pitṛīn), as, according to xii, 165.70 the "re-marrying man" (parivettar) must respectfully offer the "re-married man" (parivitti) his wife as daughter-in-law (snushā)[1]; if then the elder brother has given him leave, and if his offence has been atoned for, then he shall take her to himself by gripping her hand.[2] Thus according to xii, 165.20 the two men and the woman are freed of their fault. As opposed to this, xii, 35.28 declares: "na tu striyā bhaved dosho, na tu sā tena lipyate, but in the woman is no guilt, she is not thereby stained," which is in contradiction

[1] According to the comm. as a woman unenjoyed (abhuktā).

[2] In Assam the younger brother cannot marry before the still unwedded elder one has given leave in writing. But the latter now cannot marry any longer, and is shunned as one without a caste (Starcke, *The Primitive Family in its Origin and Development*, New York, 1889, pp. 135–36). Among the German people, too, ridicule and contempt even now fall on such a luckless fellow or lover of freedom: at the younger brother's wedding "he has to dance in the swine's trough", an expression I have heard Heaven knows how many times.

with the view also represented elsewhere in the Smṛiti ; for according to Manu, iii, 172 ; Baudhāy., ii, 1.1, 39 ; Parāçara, iv, 23, for instance, all three, together with the girl's guardian, and the sacrificial priest who officiated at the ceremony, go to hell. Rām., iv, 17.36 teaches : "The murderer of king or Brahman, the cow-slayer, the thief, he that rejoices in destroying living creatures, the atheist (nihilist), and the re-marrier—they all come into hell." According to xii, 34.4 the following stand on the same level with the Brahman-murderer : the re-marrying man, the re-married man, the younger sister that marries before the elder (agredidhishu), and the husband of an elder sister that marries after the younger sister (didhishūpati) ; another statement is in Manu, iii, 173.[1]

[1] The law books are no less severe. Both the brothers and both the husbands in case of a new marriage must for their defiling offence undertake penances. Āpastamba, ii, 5, 12.22. Brothers stained by re-marriage, the husband of the younger but first-married sister, and the husband of the later-married elder sister must, like the thief, the atheist, the man expelled from his caste, etc., not be invited to a Çrāddha or sacrifice to the dead. Gautama, xv, 16, 18. Cp. xviii, 18, 19. According to Baudhāyana, ii, 1, 1.40 the two brothers, the priest who acted at the wedding, and he that bestowed the bride, must cleanse themselves by a twelve days' Kṛicchra penance ; for the wife a three days' fast is enough. According to iv, 6.5–7 pañcagavya (a mixture of butter, milk, sour milk, dung and urine of the cow) mixed with rice-gruel is a help. All these four men participators fall into a bad offence, like the murder of one that is not a Brahman, or of a cow, like blaspheming the Veda, adultery, etc. Vishṇu, xxxvii, 13 ff. So, too, Yājñav., iii, 234 ff. Cp. Manu, xi, 6. Vishṇu, liv, 16, lays down for the participators just named and the re-married elder sister the Cāndrāyaṇa penance. Parāçara, iv, 24, prescribes for the elder brother, the priest, the bride and her guardian variously graduated mortifications (Kṛicchra, Atikṛicchra, and Cāndrāyaṇa). For the MBh., Vasishṭha, xx, 7–10 is particularly enlightening : The two brothers must undergo certain defined penances (Kṛicchra and Atikṛicchra), the younger one hand over his wife to the elder, and the latter take her as his own wife (probably in form, as the expositor says), and then give her back to the other ; then the younger must get married to her again. The man who marries a younger sister before the elder has to carry out twelve days' Kṛicchra, and then wed the elder (probably over and above the other one). The husband

In consonance with this rule it comes about that the five sons of Pāṇḍu in the order of their ages take Draupadī to wife on five following days (i, 191.8 ff.; 198.13).[1] If, on the other hand, the elder brother has been expelled from his caste (patita), or has become an ascetic (pravrajita), then the younger brother is free to wed (xii, 34.27).[2]

of an elder sister married after the younger one must do atonement with Kṛicchra and Atikṛicchra (as in Parāçara the elder brother does with doubled Kṛicchra), and hand over his wife to the husband of the younger one (probably only in form, but see Bühler's note SBE, xiv, p. 103). That the greater shame should lie mostly on the elder brother and the husband of the re-married sister seems understandable. The snushāṃ in MBh. (in itself remarkable) might be therefore a later garbling for an earlier jāyām. In the end, however, it would be better to take Nīlakaṇṭha's snushātvena to be wrong, and to translate: "The re-married man shall offer (in marriage) this daughter-in-law (to the elder brother)." The elder brother, indeed, is like the father.

[1] Winternitz in *Wiener Zschr. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenlandes*, xiv, 65 f. brings forward MBh., i, 191 and Arjuna's speech there as a leading proof of the reality of polyandric marriage, and says: "Arjuna therefore holds it as quite wrong even to think of making Draupadī the wife of him alone. He, Yudhishṭhira, must, he says, marry her first," etc. But although this reading is in agreement with the marriage of the five, as told in the Epic, and there is also no doubt about the polyandry of the Pāṇḍavas, yet this latter cannot be deduced from that passage. Niviç means simply: to found a household for oneself, and not at all: to wed a certain person. Arjuna says only this: "First Y. must take a wife, then we four brothers come in the order of our ages, and as he is the lord of us all, so he is, too, of Draupadī whom I have won." He might quite well mean here: "If he wishes to marry her for himself only, that is right and good." In any case what is here expressed is only the dread of the sin of "re-marrying".

[2] According to Parāçara, iv, 25 the younger may marry without regard to the elder, if the latter is hunchbacked, a dwarf, impotent, weak-witted, gadgada (a stutterer?), blind, deaf, or dumb from birth. Those mentioned here and in our Mahābhārata passage, together with some other afflicted ones, are not entitled either to inherit or to have law dealings. They may, indeed, marry, at least as a general rule, and their offspring can inherit, if this offspring have no defects. See Manu, ix, 201–203, and the parallels given by Bühler in his transl. (according to Vishṇu, xv, 35 ff., the exceptions are the offspring

As is well known the polygamy of the man in Aryan India is as old as the hills and does not form the slightest offence in the Brahmanic system, although since Vedic times, indeed, one wife is seen to be the usual, often the obvious thing. On the other hand, polyandry is utterly repugnant to Indian feelings, and in the Epic only one or two cases of it are found, and these are exclusively cases of a community of wives among brothers.

It is a remarkable fact that the chief heroes of the Mahābh., the five brothers, have one wife or head-wife in common, Draupadī. Yet this is not so wonderful if we bear in mind the origin of the Pāṇḍavas. In very many places the Epic shows with the utmost clearness that the Kauravas are the original heroes of the poem, and, as I hold, not, so to say, only those of "ballads or ballad cycles" which came before the putting together of the actual Epic, but those of a greater poem, of an epic of the Bharatas. No less clearly does the present text also show us what unauthorized stranger intruders of a later date the Pāṇḍavas are. Nothing could be more evident, whatever one's attitude may be to Holtzmann's theory in detail. To all seeming, the Pāṇḍavas were even of non-Aryan stock; and no one with an open mind can let himself think that they were any cousins of the Kauravas, as the later revision would have us believe. Polyandry must probably be called non-Aryan, in spite of the objection raised by Jolly (*Recht und Sitte*, p. 48), and the five brothers, too, were certainly non-Aryan. They may very well have belonged to one of the many aboriginal peoples or tribes which dwelt and still dwell in India and on its boundaries, and have kept polyandry down to this day.[1] It then

of those deprived of caste, if born after the criminal offence, and that of the child, likewise outside the law, which was begotten of a woman of higher caste. Cp. Gautama, xxviii, 45, and especially Kauṭilya (transl.) 257.3 ff. and addits.) Among the South Slavs also it is held to be "a firm-based principle of customary law"—and this prevails among them as among the Indians, and among all primitive peoples and tribes—"that younger brothers and sisters must not marry before the elder ones." But exceptions are made, when the elder brother has a mental or serious bodily illness, or becomes a priest, or expressly gives his leave. Krauss, *Sitte und Brauch*, etc. 334 f.

[1] A good short account of them in Jolly, *Recht und Sitte*, p. 48. Cp. Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ii, 155 ff. The above words, too,

was a task of heavy toil to justify this shocking moral defect of the chief heroes and the pillars of the Brahmanic Mahābhārata. The one explanation is this: When the five brothers, who are going about in Brahman garb, bring Draupadī to their mother, and show her to her, the mother does not notice what this bhikshā (alms) is, that she supposes has been brought home from the begging they ply, and says: "Enjoy it together." The mistake has now been made once for all, and both she and her band of sons now think that the word of a mother is holy and must be held to, absolutely and after the letter. Moreover, they are all aflame with love for the wonderfully fair one, and so Yudhishṭhira deems that therefore they would rather all possess her together than that, through her, strife should come about among the brothers (i, 191). When now they tell Draupadī's father of their polyandric intentions, who has naturally thought that Arjuna has won her and shall marry her, he along with his kinsfolk is deeply wounded in his moral feelings. He makes the strongest protest against such an unheard of adharma (lawlessness, wrong), conflicting with worldly custom and the Veda. Yudhishṭhira, however, has his usual Pilate saying ready to hand: "What is Dharma (right, the good)? No one can find his way in such a ticklish question. We take the path which our forefathers followed one after the other," a way of speech, therefore, like that used of marriage by purchase in royal families, although in our passage it is quite likely that only a general view can be in question. Then a family council is held. Drupada, the father, keeps his ground: "I hold it for an adharma that is opposed to the world and the Veda. For one wife for many—there is no such thing. Neither did the high-souled forefathers have this custom,

were written wholly under the influence of reading the MBh. itself. Afterwards I saw to my satisfaction that other investigators had long ago uttered such views. Thus Winternitz leans towards the view that the Pāṇḍavas were a "non-Aryan mountain tribe" (WZKM, xiv, 71). So Hopkins, *The Great Epic*, pp. 376, 400. On the other hand I do not believe that from the passages brought forward by Winternitz and others polyandry for India can really be deduced. Cp. also Jacobi, *Göttinger Gel. Auzeigen* 1899, p. 885.

nor must we in any wise be guilty of this offence against custom and law." His son Dhṛishṭadyumna gives his opinion : "How could an elder brother of virtuous ways draw nigh unto the wife of his younger brother?" Yudhishṭhira keeps to it that the highest authority on earth is the mother. In olden times, too, he says, Jaṭilā of Gotama's race had seven Ṛishis as husbands, so, too, did the Muni's daughter Vārkshī have regular intercourse with the ten ascetically cleansed Pracetas brothers.[1] Kuntī agrees with him : "So it is. And I have a dreadful fear of lying." The holy patriarch of the family, Vyāsa, is present and announces : "It is the holy and eternal law even as Yudhishṭhira has spoken." Then he rises, takes the king by the hand, with him leaves the gathering, and now tells him of the cause :

Once the gods made a great sacrifice ; Yama was the slaying priest ; he now utterly neglected his office as god of death ; creatures no longer died, and their numbers brought anxiety. There was no longer any distinction between mortals and immortals. Then went the gods to Brahma to complain to him of this distress. He consoled them by telling them that Yama would split up his personality, and they were now to fill this second half with their power, and thus it would bring death to beings. In content the gods went to the sacrifice. Then they saw on the Gaṅgā a lotus-flower. The hero among them, Indra, was sent off to find out whence it came. He saw a glorious woman weeping at the source of the Gaṅgā, and her tears as they dropped became golden lotus-flowers. He asked her the reason of her sorrow. She led him on to the mountain top. There he saw a handsome youth playing dice together with a young lady ; as the youth, however, in his eagerness to play gave him no heed whatever, the king of the gods grew angered, and boasted of being lord of the world. The youth laughed at him, and looked at him. At this Indra became as stiff as a tree-stump. Çiva (this was the dicing hero) bade the woman that shed tears of golden lotuses to

[1] How this "daughter of a tree" came wonderfully into being from the trees, and her marriage with the ten Pracetases is told in the Purāṇas, e.g. Vishṇu, i, 15 ; Agni, xviii, 22 ff.; Bhāgavata, iv, 30.47 ff. Her name was Marishā.

take the haughty one into a cave in the mountain.[1] There he saw four shining figures sitting, like him down to the last hair. At the sight of them he was gripped by sorrow : " Shall I perhaps become like these ? " Angrily Çiva told him that these were four earlier Indras that had been as haughty, too, as he. For this they had all had to come into human life, and would bring about great deeds in it. The four Indras begged : " May the gods of right and of the wind, Indra and the two Açvins, beget us." Indra promised to give them a fifth as fellow, sprung from his seed. Now this is Arjuna, and his four brothers are the four former Indras. In kindness of heart Çiva also granted them the boon that that weeping woman, the goddess Lakshmī, should be their wife in mankind. She was then born in wondrous wise to Drupada out of the ground (mahītalāt). Vyāsa through his ascetic powers then endowed the king Drupada with the eye of a god ; so Drupada saw the five brothers and Draupadī in their heavenly forms, and was now fully contented.

Then quite needlessly Vyāsa told him the same tale he had told (i, 169) the five brothers before their wooing of Draupadī, and in more or less the same words ; the trishṭubh metre goes over into the çloka at the beginning of this piece : There was once the daughter of a Ṛishi, who because of her deeds in an earlier existence found no husband in spite of her beauty. Then she gave herself up to hard penance, and when the rejoiced Çiva asked her what she would have, in her fierce yearning she uttered five times : " Give me a proper man." " Good ; five shalt thou have, since thou hast said it five times." And her remonstrance that she only wanted one was of no help (i, 191 ff.).[2]

The state of things brought about by this marriage now gave rise to some difficulty. The divine Ṛishi Nārada, the wandering journalist of the Indian heaven comes up and begs

[1] The world as the dice-game of a god, and Çiva and his wife as players, are often-recurring Indian thoughts.

[2] The two last legends are clearly marked as being very late, childish inventions. See, too, Winternitz, JRAS, 1897, pp. 733 ff. An explanation that is partly more sensible, but partly nonsense is given in Mārkaṇḍeyapur., v.

the brothers in heartrending words not to quarrel among themselves because of the woman, as the over-fierce Daitya brothers Sunda and Upasunda once had done ; and as a warning example he tells them the tale of these demon giants, who held all three worlds in the ban of their rule of terror until the Apsaras Tilottamā through her peerless loveliness so strongly fired them both that they slew one another (i, 209–212). Then the Pāṇḍavas settle it between themselves : if one of us comes to another while the latter is with Draupadī, then he must live in chastity twelve years in the forest.[1] Now one day a Brahman comes who has just had his cows stolen, and sets up a truly priestlike outcry before the rulers forgetful of their duty, the Pāṇḍavas. Arjuna is at once ready to punish, and only wants to fetch his arms quickly. But alas ! these are in a room where, at this very moment, Yudhishṭhira is with

[1] The first half of the çloka (212.29) is = Draupadyā sahāsīnam anyam no 'nyo 'bhidarçayet. Böhtlingk's rendering : " to betray " is quite a mistaken one. Cp. 213.19, 27, 31, 32. It can be seen how foreign to the Aryan Indians polyandric relations are. Where polyandry prevails the matter is mostly very easily arranged. Either each sharer in the marriage then takes his turn on his fixed days, or a sign before the entrance to the woman warns the others. Such a *cave canem* before the gate to the common love-paradise was among the Massagetae the quiver, of the man who was with her, hanging to the wife's waggon ; among the Nasamones in Libya the happy man left his staff at the door ; so, too, in Arabia Felix and among the Sabæans. Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, ii, 130 ; Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, i, 1^3, pp. 25, 30; Lippert, *Kulturgesch.*, ii, 11–12. The staff, arrow, or shoe among the old Arabs had to be shown to keep away him that was not called. Welhausen, *Gött. Nachr.* 1893, p. 462. Cp. 464. The Tiyan in Malabar make use of a knife in the door-frame as a warning sign, the Izhuva or Taudan in South Malabar make use of a vessel with water before the entrance. Hartland, l.c., ii, pp. 165 f. As is well known it is not only poverty that is the cause of polyandry, as has been asserted. Rather the wife of many is just as proud of her wealth in husbands as the polygamist is of his crowd of wives ; and the Tibetan woman, for instance, pities her poor European sister who has to be satisfied with only one representative of manhood. No : the more husbands, the greater happiness. Hartland, ii, 161 ff. Cp. 182.

Draupadī. He has also the holy duty to take leave of his eldeſt brother. After long wreſtling with his conſcience Arjuna decides for the higher duty; he goes in and fetches the weapons. After he has run the robbers to earth, he comes home again to the ſound of rejoicings, and makes ready for his long exile in chaſtity. Yudhiſhṭhira is utterly overwhelmed, declares he bears him no anger whatever, and that all is well. "For if the younger goes in to the elder (while the latter is with the woman) then that is no harm or wrong (upaghāta); but if the elder goes in to the younger, then that is a breach of the holy ordinance." But Arjuna in his true boyiſh way riſes proudly up, and ſhouts: "How ſhould I ſwerve from the truth!" For Draupadī this parade of virtue muſt have been the more unpleaſing in that ſhe did not fully ſhare in the diſintereſtedneſs of the brothers; ſhe is accuſed of having preferred Arjuna, and has to atone for it at the great departure for heaven (xiv, 87.10; xvii, 2.3 ff.).

It is in harmony with Yudhiſhṭhira's words that even Dhṛiſhṭadyumna only proteſts againſt one thing, that the younger brother Arjuna, to whom Draupadī really belongs, has to ſhare her with the elder. But that the younger brothers have access to the wife of the elder one ſeems to appear to him not at all unnatural or unlawful (i, 196.10). This exactly corresponds with the well-known arrangement in group-marriage, or better, fellowſhip marriage of brothers, and is reflected, too, in a mythical tale in the Mahābh. "Now there was once a famous wiſe Ṛiſhi, called Utathya. Mamatā was the name of his much-prized wife. But Utathya's younger brother, the ſacrificial prieſt of the heaven-dwellers, Bṛihaſpati the majeſtic, forced himſelf on Mamatā. But Mamatā ſaid to her brother-in-law, beſt among ſpeakers: 'But I am with child by thine elder brother. Deſiſt. And this offſpring of Utathya within my body has already ſtudied the Veda with its ſix auxiliary ſciences. But thou art a man of irreſiſtibly powerful ſeed. Two cannot find room here. But as things are ſo, do thou therefore now withdraw.' Though thus addreſſed by her aright, yet the noble-minded Bṛihaſpati could not hold back his ſoul filled with love's urge. Then, with love's longing full, he united himſelf with her,

who had none of love's longing. But as he ejaculated the seed, he that was in the womb said to him : 'Listen, father dear, do not give way to love's heat, there is no room here for two, the space is small.[1] And I came here first. And withal, thy seed, O holy one, is not barren ; I pray thee not crowd me.' But Bṛihaspati listened not to these words of the child in the womb, but only forced his way into the lovely-eyed Mamatā to beget. When he that rested in the womb marked the spurting seed, with his feet he barred the way against Bṛihaspati's seed. Then the seed fell swiftly onto the earth, driven back without reaching its place. At this Bṛihaspati was angered ; when he saw the seed fall down, filled with rage he cursed Utathya's son that was in the womb, he the holy seer, did abuse him : 'Since thou hast spoken such words to me at a time like this, which all beings yearn after, thou shalt go into a long darkness (dīrghatamas).'" The Ṛishi was of a truth born under the name of Dīrghatamas, blind from his birth owing to the curse of the high-famed Bṛihaspati, equal to Bṛihaspati in strength and power (i, 104.9 ff.).[2]

It is, indeed, a strange thing to find a usage, which aroused the moral feelings of the Indian, unhesitatingly ascribed to this priest of the gods, Bṛihaspati, and to his brother, as also to other Ṛishis and holy women ; and one feels tempted to look on such things as echoes from a time when, among even the Aryans also, group-marriage may have been a recognized institution. But such a conclusion would seem to be at least a highly uncertain one ; for what stories are not told among the different peoples of gods and holy men ! The Indian has often declared, in the Epic, too, that such divine figures as these are not tied down to the laws of earth, that mankind indeed must follow a loftier ethic than they. True, enlightened views such as these belong to a later time, of noble spiritual and emotional culture, and can hardly be assumed in the age

[1] Less likely : "for two, with the narrow space, there is no being begotten" (literally : there is no being begotten in a small space).

[2] The same ancient legend, which of course has been devised as an explanation of the name of the seer and singer Dīrghatamas, is found again, told shortly, in the xiith book, chap. 341, çl. 49 ff. Cp. also Winternitz, WZKM, xx, 31 ff.

when such myths were being shaped, or in the days before it. And if for that earlier period, too, the same lofty character of at least some minds were to be assumed, such as shows itself already in the oldest Upanishad, that would prove nothing for or against the conditions that might be actually existing. Thus there is left always a certain doubt. But it is quite clear that, as it was, Draupadī's marriage was reluctantly taken; and the words of Karṇa, the bitter foe, indeed, of the princess of Pañcāla, may not have stood so isolated in a more primitive form of the Epic: "One husband is appointed unto the wife by the gods. But this one yields herself into the power of more men than one, and therefore this is certain: She is an evil woman" (ii, 68.35).[1]

Like these legendary traditions of polyandric marriages is the evidence in the Epic as to earlier or still existing conditions of hetærism.[2] The gospel of unrestricted free love, from the

[1] In the Daçakumārac. (p. 209 of my translation), among the "devilish wiles" of the gods and holy men (which, however, "because of the power of the knowledge of their virtue," were not "detrimental"), it is also alleged that Bṛihaspati used to visit the wife of Utathi. With this cp., too, for instance, Samayamātṛikā, iv, 20–35.

[2] Such mythical tales of earlier times often seem to me to be altogether too bold to be used as wholly credible grounds of proof. Like other peoples, the Indians too—and especially often and gloomily—speak of an earlier "time without a ruler and filled with terror": there was at that time utter lawlessness, they ate one another, all crimes were daily events, until men met together, and chose themselves a king (from the Epic cp. for instance MBh., xii, 67; Rām., vii, 76.33 ff. under the text as çlokāḥ prakshiptāḥ). To say nothing of the fact that this picture does not correspond with more primitive conditions, the Indians who told such tales had at any rate no longer any memory of such misty far-off days. A pet theory set the powers of imagination at work. The Aino, who are well known to be monogamic, relate in their tales that men were allowed in olden days to have more wives than one (Chamberlain, *Aino Folk Tales*, p. 48). Here it is a quite natural sophistication of the understanding that is speaking, or the knowledge that such a thing is customary among other peoples. Polyandry is nowhere found in the Veda, but probably, as already pointed out, it was to be found among the primitive population in and about India. The conditions among them have, anyhow, been the leading cause of such suggestions. But then, mainly under their influence, polyandry

lips of the sun god—in this case, indeed, not unprejudiced—has already been listened to by us. The Indians tell many tales of the Uttarakurus dwelling in the north, an ideal people in an ideal land that is a real Utopia. There, we are told, the women follow their own inclinations (kāmacarā bhavanti), and neither man nor woman knows jealousy (īrshyā nāsti narīnarāṇām, xiii, 102.26 ; cp. xiii, 2.13 ff.).[1] In the thirty-first chapter of Book ii there is a description of how Sahadeva, Yudhishṭhira's brother, when on his world-conquering expedition (digvijaya), reaches the farthest south. Before Māhishmatī, the city of the king there, Nīla,[2] he finds himself in very great distress, for the god of fire is standing by Nīla, and everything

may have been found in isolated cases among the Aryan Indians also. The Aino just mentioned believe that, in the far past, girls enjoyed full freedom in sexual intercourse (*Anthropos*, Bd. v, p. 770). Among them it is not so, but it is so among a vast number of peoples and tribes of older times and of to-day, and in the most different lands. The Kanakas have a tradition that originally a man had always but one wife (*Anthropos*, ii, p. 385), a shrewd blow against current "proofs" of the development of marriage, by way of promiscuity and other horrors, into monogamy. Those who play about with survivals often seem quite to have forgotten that man, and above all, more primitive man and the child, has not only his actual experience and his memory (which is, however, exceedingly weak) of it, but still more a heart filled with yearnings, an inquisitive understanding, and unchecked powers of imagination. And in the name of Heaven what would be the good of poor mortal man making himself gods, legendary heroes, and saints, if they could not do things which the everyday child cannot allow himself to do!

Horace Man reports a remarkable case of polyandry in the Nicobars. The woman had no children by her first husband ; she therefore married a second, and could then prove the truth of her suspicion as to number one ; both the husbands lived peacefully together, but everyone laughed at the family (*Transactions of the 9th Internat. Congr. of Orientalists*, vol. ii, p. 891).

[1] There, indeed, the "beauteous maidens grow on trees", and all live only for the pleasures of love, as the Epic, too, relates (see, for instance, Rām., ii, 91.19 ; iv, 43.37 ff.). [From Melanesia for plants turning into women cp. G. C. Wheeler, *Mono-Alu Folklore* (London, 1926), pp. 25–6 (Translator).]

[2] "Blue-black."

in Sahadeva's army, man and beast, goes up in flames. "For it is learned that the uplifter of sacrifices (Agni) that dwells in Mīhishmatī had once been found out as an adulterer.[1] The daughter of King Nīla was fair beyond everything. She always came to kindle the burnt sacrifice. But the fire would not blaze up, even when fanned with fans, until it was set alight with wind coming from the lovely rounded lips. Then the holy Agni fell in love with this maiden, who was sweet to look on, for King Nīla and all, and she took him to her.[2] But once when he happened to be sporting in love (with her) in the form of a Brahman, the just king chastised him according to the precept. Then the glorious uplifter of sacrifices blazed up in wrath. When the king saw him he was filled with wonder, and bent his head to the ground. Then, in time, the prince, with head bent likewise,[3] gave this maiden as wife to the fire god with the Brahman form. Then when the shining one had accepted this lovely-browed daughter of King Nīla, he bestowed his favour on the king. The most excelling fulfiller of wishes offered the prince a favour, and the lord of

[1] Pāradārika, therefore, here used of wrongful behaviour with a woman who is not (here even : not yet) wedded to a man. As to the position of Māhishmatī, "sacred to Agni," see Pargiter, Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Calcutta, 1904), p. 333, note ‡.

[2] Hardly : "while Nīla, yet, was the king of all." We might perhaps read : Nīlasyājñasya sarveshām, or better still : Nīlasyājñāte sarveshām "without Nīla (and) all knowing anything of it, she took him to her". The genitive too in -sya is sometimes, however, used as an ablat. in the MBh. (i, 228.17 ; ii, 81.37 ; xii, 198.6, 11 ; 218.28 ; xiv, 24.11 ; espec. too x, 2.6, where daivasya = without favourable fate). See further x, 10.14 ; xii, 216.8. If taken so, the traditional text, "without Nīla (and) all," would come to the same thing. That is to say, therefore : "without N. or anyone else having known of it." Fire, moreover, must not be blown up by the mouth. Mārk.-Pur., xxxiv, 112 ; Manu, iv, 53 ; Gautama, ix, 32 ; Āpast., ii, 5, 15.20 ; Vasishṭha, xii, 27. Nor must the feet be warmed at fire, nor put over or under it, nor must one jump over it. Vishṇu, lxxi, 37 ; Yājñav, i, 137 ; Manu, iv, 53 f. Of course, it must not be touched with the foot (MBh., vii, 73.30 ; K., xiv, 108.13 ff. ; Yājñav., i, 155).

[3] Or perhaps: as it should be, in the right way (tathaiva).

earth chose invulnerableness in his army. From that time all that through want of understanding (or: knowledge) try to take this city are forcibly burned by the fire god. And in this city of Māhishmatī, as is well known, the women, too, were then freed from interference as to their wishes.[1] Thus Agni granted women the favour that they are not to be held back; for there the women are wholly free, and go the way that pleases them."

In the Mahābh., i, 122 King Pāṇḍu makes the following speech to his wife, "harmonizing with law and virtue." "Now will I make known to thee the true essence of dharma (law, custom, virtue), listen unto me, the ancient dharma perceived by the lofty-minded knowers of it. In former times, as is well known, women were left unhindered,[2] O thou of the lovely face, going the way of their desires, in freedom, O sweet-smiling one. When they, from the years of maidenhood on, did trick their husbands,[3] that was nothing wrong, O lovely-hipped one, but rather that was the right thing in former times. And the same moral law of early times is followed still to-day, free from love and anger, by the beings that linger in an animal-birth. This is the moral order laid down by

[1] Babhūvur anatigrāhyā yoshitaç chandataḥ kila. More exactly, that is to say: freed from encroachments. I take the word as = avinigrāhya. "Not to be outdone in their sexual longing" (according to a meaning given by Pāṇini) would not go well here.

[2] Anāvṛita unhindered, not forbidden, accessible to all, not restrained, unbridled, free. This word is often found in the MBh., particularly as applied to woman, and always with this meaning. As a commentary take only i, 229.9, 13: anāvṛita = apratishiddhabhoga; vii, 40.36 compared with 44.13 = asaṃyata. It has also the meaning: unclad, naked, and so Jacobi takes it here. Context, use of words, and çl. 14 forbid this rendering, important as this further statement would be.

[3] A maiden, who does not keep her chastity, sins against her future husband. While this view is rooted in the rough conception that the man's right of property has even a retrospective force, yet in a noble and beautiful meaning it is true; only it must likewise be applied, too, to the man's behaviour before marriage. Agni is perhaps accordingly accused of adultery for lying with a maiden.

the rule of conduct[1]; it was honoured by the great Ṛishi through observance, and to-day is still honoured among the Uttarakurus, O thou with the banana-like thighs. For this is the eternal law that shows favour to women. By whom, however, and on what grounds, a short while ago the barrier of to-day was set up in our world—learn this now at full length, O brightly-smiling one, from me. There was once a great Ṛishi, Uddālaka by name, thus we have heard. Çvetaketu was his famous son, the Muni. This Çvetaketu set up this barrier of the moral law, and from anger, O thou with lotus-leaf eyes. Hear from me why. Once, then, a Brahman took Çvetaketu's mother by the hand, before his father's eyes, and said: 'Let us go.' Driven by displeasure, the Ṛishi's son gave himself up to wrath, when he saw his mother thus led away as though by force. To the angry Çvetaketu his father spoke, when he saw him thus: 'Do not yield thyself up to wrath, O dear one. This is the eternal law. For the female beings of all kinds are unhindered (anāvrita). As the cows stand before our eyes, dear one, so are all creatures in their various kinds.'[2] But the Ṛishi's son would not bear

[1] Pramāṇa. This word is rendered by Nīl. in an earlier passage by veda. Na cirāt, in the following, might perhaps mean: after a short time (instead of: a short while ago).

[2] The Old Indians have indeed here too, fully anticipated the theories of modern science: In the beginning all the men of the clan, the horde, or the tribe had the right to enjoy all the women of the community; then came marriage, whether polyandric, polygamic, or monogamic, "simple or mixed," but at first always with the very actual consciousness still (and one that was often obeyed) that, in spite of it, access to a woman was not barred to the other men. In perfect harmony with our tale, for example, is the custom among the polygamous Nasamones and the monogamic Massagetae, among whom even after marriage the wife could be freely visited by all the men. Withal, in all probability, father-right prevailed in the original Indo-Germanic people, not, as has been held, mother-right. Yet among many Indo-Germanic peoples in later times there is evidence even of a community of wives, not to speak of other loose customs. See Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altertums*, i, 1, pp. 26 f. And the patriarchate is in itself consistent with the greatest unconcern as to the woman's chasteness, and even after marriage. Cp. for this chapter, among the moderns, Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, especially the second volume, and in

with this law, and he laid down the following moral order for woman and man, among human beings only, O excellent one, but not among other creatures ; and since that time this moral rule has been in existence, and so we have heard : ' If a woman is unfaithful to her husband, then, from to-day onwards, that is a crime leading to loss of caste, like the killing of a child in the womb, gruesome and bringing down evil. And in like wise it is a crime leading to loss of caste, if a man is unfaithful to his wife, that has walked in maidenly chastity and keeps faith with her husband. A wife lays the same burden on herself, if she be charged by her husband for the sake of a son,[1] and does

this especially 101–248 ; H. Schurtz, *Urgesch. d. Kultur* (1900), pp. 105 ff.; Ed. Meyer, loc. cit., pp. 15–30. I name these three excellent works, too, because they are written from differing standpoints. Schurtz, indeed, believes that he finds the " way out of the dilemma " in the highly important theory arising out of his studies on " age-classes and men's associations " (1902, see espec. pp. 54–56), namely, that the " general course of development was this, that the younger men had the utmost freedom of sexual intercourse with all the girls of the tribe, but the older men married " (*Urgesch. d. Kultur*, espec. 123 f.). In which case therefore only the cripples of love, so to say, would have agreed to marriage—just as it happens so often among us. Eduard Meyer, who here often finds himself with Schurtz, even makes the monstrous assertion that " the free union of the sexes, and therefore promiscuous likewise, exists without exception among all peoples and in every community, whether it be that intercourse is left fully free, or whether it is put under fixed regulations, and, for instance, is only allowed between members of certain groups, or whether it is allowed to the girls before marriage, or, as with the widespread religious prostitution, is directly enjoined. . . . Among Christian peoples, in direct contrast to this, free sexual intercourse . . . is officially forbidden, but is not thereby the less zealously practised " (*Gesch. d. Altertums*, i, 1. 3, pp. 17 f.). Things, indeed, are bad enough on this point, but such words give an untrue and distorted picture ; in olden and in modern times there are plenty of peoples who give much heed to the girl's chastity, to say nothing of the married woman ; and in civilized Christian mankind there are, in spite of everything, very many chaste wives, and unspotted maids. Here we are not speaking of the men.

[1] To let offspring be begotten of herself by another man. Niyukta and niyoga (charged, ordering) is the technical term for begetting

it not.' With these words, O timid one, did Çvetaketu, the son of Uddālaka, set up by force the barrier of the moral law . . . At the time of the Ṛitu,[1] O king's daughter, thou so faithful to thy husband, the wife shall not go afield from her husband ; these are the words of the law recognized by the law-learned. At all other times the woman has free independence (svātantryaṃ strī kilārhati) for herself. It is such a law that good men call the old one." [2]

in another's stead, especially when the brother-in-law or some other kinsman raises up, with the widow, children for the dead man. On this see below.

[1] The days immediately following the menses, which are proper for conception. The husband, therefore, shall not then be injured in his title to beget children. Cp. Kauṭilya (transl.) addit. 252.26 ; MBh. K., xiii, 58–59.

[2] The teaching here set forth is anyhow more acceptable than the actual custom of the Hassanieh Arabs, of whom J. Petherick (*Egypt, the Soudan and Central Africa*, p. 151) reports that the wives in this tribe are only bound to be faithful to their husbands for three or four days out of the seven in the week and that the latter feel themselves highly flattered if their fairer halves have a great many love adventures during the marriage holiday ; for they would look on this as a proof that their wives were attractive (Finck, *Primitive Love Stories*, p. 92 ; Henne am Rhyn, *Die Frau in der Kulturgesch.*, Berlin, 1892, p. 20 ; Hartland, ii, 222). The Bahuana in the Congo area demand faithfulness of their wives only during pregnancy : they believe that at this time other sexual intercourse harms the child. Not only is the husband, among not a few peoples, left cold if his wife bestows her favours on others, but often it is even the greatest honour for the wife if she is embraced by a great many ; her owner then basks, like the Hassanieh just mentioned, in the consciousness of calling such a treasure his own. So the Brame in Africa is proud when his wife has many lovers ; the Kamchadale women plume themselves on the number of their lovers ; among the Gindans the fair, like the "lady in the chest", who is especially known from the Arabian story-book, used to wear, as a token of each man conquered and embraced by them, a leathern anklet ; among the Bullam, Bago, and Timmaney in West Africa the married woman who should repel a man she had kindled would be held as extremely uncivil and badly brought up ; and among the inhabitants of the island of Augila, and the Nasamones, the more men lay with a newly-wedded wife on the wedding night, the greater the

brilliance in which she shone. Hartland, ii, 119, 183, 131, 118; Ed. Meyer, loc. cit., p. 24; Lippert, *Kulturgesch.*, ii, 14; cp. J. J. Meyer, *Isoldes Gottesurteil*, p. 15 and note 9, and on this Hartland, ii, 174; Müller-Lyer, *Phasen d. Liebe* (München, 1913), pp. 7 ff.

The woman is only a chattel; her good points or her defects have their meaning and being only with reference to the man: to his sexual pleasure, his feeling of power, his vanity, and so forth. The virginity of girls is very generally, among the ruder peoples and tribes, not in the slightest an object of desire. Prostitution as a matter of course for the as yet unmarried woman is what may be really called the rule among them. Of course there are many exceptions. Indeed, what is there for the man in such a comfortless "fiction of the brain", as Brantôme calls the maidenhead! Maidenly purity, indeed, often is looked on as a shame, even a crime, plenty of intercourse as an honour for the girl—anyhow a more consistent view for all that than that found among us, which one-sidedly so appraises only the man. See, e.g. Daçakumāracaritam (in my transl.), p. 45, n. 2; Ploss-Bartels[4], pp. 172, 349, 429, 459; ii, 429; Finck, *Prim. Love*, 44; 543 ff.; Engels, *Ursprung d. Familie*, etc. (1894), pp. 35 f.; Westermarck, *Human Marriage*[3], p. 81; Starcke, *Prim. Family*, 121 ff.; Hartland, i, 31; ii, 102 ff. (the whole of the 6th chapter with numberless examples), 254 ff., and elsewhere in the 7th chapter; Schurtz, *Urgesch. d. Kultur*, ch. ii, espec. p. 123 ff.; *Altersklassen u. Männerbünde*, 91–93; Reitzenstein, *Zeitschr. f. Ethnolog.*, Bd. 41, p. 676; *Anthropos*, vi, 372; vii, 100; Yule's *Marco Polo*[3], ii, 44 (in Tebet [Tibet] every girl got a ring from each man that had enjoyed her, and unless she could show at least twenty she did not find a husband; cp. the further examples there p. 48). And so on *ad infinitum*. This may then not seldom lead to such incidents as the Finnish peasant writer Alkio describes in *Puukojunkarit* ("Knife Heroes"), his great picture of life in Österbotten in the sixties of last century: here too, many girls at least find a pride in letting as many young men as possible have a share in their bed. If a new love candidate then comes while one is already lying in the fair one's arms, then there is a proper fight, in which the knife, too, is often used, till one of them is beaten and thrown down the stairs. Then while the loser is picking up his bones down below as well as he can, the one favoured by the god of battle refreshes himself upstairs in the bosom of the large-hearted country girl. The same thing is also often found elsewhere among the peasantry. Cp. for instance Jeremias Gotthelf's great novel *Anne Bäbi Jowäger*, espec. i, ch. 13–15. That retrospective proprietary feeling of the man is either not yet to be found there, or it is satisfied by the vanity of the

owner of a wife that formerly was so run after, feeling itself highly gratified; he it is that has carried off such a pearl and cut the others out! How, then, should this vanity not be just as delightfully puffed up, when she that is already married has a strong attraction for others! If we read this sentence (already, indeed, anticipated by Rousseau) in Engels, *Der Ursprung d. Familie*, etc. (1894), p. 17: "If anything is sure, it is this, that jealousy is a feeling developed relatively late," then at first we call such a thing monstrous beyond words. And yet, Finck above all (pp. 82 ff.; 438 ff. and elsewhere, as also Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, especially ch. vi) has brought together overwhelming evidence that real jealousy is hardly to be met with among more primitive peoples; among the men we can only speak, at most, of anger at the infringement of their rights of property, among the women, of envy for her that is favoured by the husband with better treatment. Here and there outward circumstances may have contributed towards men and women manifesting an indifference like this—lower than among the beasts—in things of love. Thus among the Eskimos there is the stress of life (Dr. H. C. Stratz, *Die Frauenkleidung in ihrer natürl. Entwickl.*[3], p. 18). Especially when the chief, prince, or priest drinks from the same cup as ordinary mortals, the men thus favoured feel the most devout, nay, proudest joy, and that not only among the Kalmucks (Westermarck, p. 79; Finck, 44–45). *Tout comme chez nous* is what even the civilized European must acknowledge, who is familiar with history and the present day.

The "cattle-girl" in Johannes Schlaf and her sly mate *in spe* is often far outdone. So, for instance, by many tribes in Algiers. There the father sends the daughter who is ripe out into the world, that she may gather as much together by her charms as possible. Then the girls get married, and those get a husband the quickest who can show by plenty of jingling money how greatly the treasures of their love have been sought after. This is reported particularly of the Uled Nail, and indeed the father, so it is said, there takes the money brought home (Robert, *XIV. Internat. Orientalistenkongress*, 3rd Sect., pp. 572 ff.; Schweiger-Lerchenfeld, *Die Frauen d. Orients*, p. 296). In the same way the fathers in Nicaragua used to send their daughters through the land, for them to get themselves a dowry by way of prostitution (Finck, 565, note; 610). And in old Grecian times on the island of Cyprus the girls earned their wedding-portion by going to the shore and giving themselves to seafarers and travellers (Brantôme, vol. ii, 375a). Cp. Lippert, *Kulturgesch.*, ii, 13–19; Ploss-Bartels, i, 413–15; ii, 17. Of very many peoples it is reported that the men make a full use of their wives as a source of income by giving them up to others. There is a particularly rich collection

Another account of the origin of to-day's conditions is given in i, 104.22 ff. The blind seer, Dīrghatamas, who had already been disturbed in the womb by the unbridled passion of his uncle, and possibly was thereby already disposed this way—one of the Vedic singers—finds a young and lovely Brahmanic wife, by name Pradveshī, and begets several sons by her. "The Muni, filled with righteousness and virtue, noble-minded, and who had reached the further shore of the Veda and Vedāṅga, learned fully from Saurabheya (the son of the divine cow of wishes) the "custom of the cattle",[1] and he set about practising it, full of yearning[2] and without fear. As the excellent Munis now looked on him as one that was following a wrong ordinance, they were all angered, who dwelt there in the hermitage, and overcome by a foolish blindness, speaking thus of the Muni

again in Finck, passim, and in the 6th chapter of Hartland's *Primitive Paternity*. The old king Pāṇḍu was therefore on the right track.

But it is another question whether we can regard as proof his and the other statements in the MBh. as to promiscuity in the Aryan prehistory of India. The theory of hetærism or promiscuity as the primary stage of mankind is, indeed, now given up by the most competent investigators, and since the Indo-Europeans evidently already had a well-ordered family life before their dispersal, and the Veda, too, knows nothing of any hetærism, we cannot put our trust in such legends for taking so break-neck a leap into the greyest dawn of time. The Greeks and probably other peoples, too, spin tales in the same way, of certain men having introduced marriage, the women having been up till then in common.

[1] According to Nīl. this is public copulation. But why should D. have to "fully learn" such a usage? One would be inclined to think of the joyous heat, painted by Boccaccio, of the stallions and mares on the Thessalian plains, which the woman described to us by him (and before that by Apuleius in the *Golden Ass*) imitates with her lover, as she stands by the great vat in which her good, scouring husband is toiling away. The amorous enjoyment paçuvat is of course looked on as orthodox. There were also probably other special "refinements" in this case. Of course, D. likewise did the thing publicly, as we must conclude. On the public sexual act cp. Müller-Lyer, *Phasen d. Liebe*, 16 f.; 65; Schrader, *Die Indogermanen*, 76.

[2] This would seem to be the translation. Otherwise çraddhāvant usually means "he that is filled with belief".

Dīrghatamas[1]: "Alas! this man hath broken the moral rule, and therefore must not live in the hermitage. Therefore will we all shun this evil-minded one." And since his wife had won sons, she was then not at his call and bidding. And to the hating wife the husband said: "Wherefore dost thou hate me?" Pradveshī spoke: "Because the husband gives food to the wife, therefore, after the tradition, is he called husband; and because he offers her shelter, he is called her lord.[2] I that have not power to maintain thee will not be ever drudging and keeping thee, blind from birth, together with thy children, O great penitent." When the Ṛishi had heard her words, he spoke, filled with wrath, to Pradveshī and her sons: "Lead me into the house of a Kshattriya, and wealth of possessions will be our lot." Pradveshī spoke: "Possessions given by thee, O Brahman, I would not have; they bring sorrow. Do as thou wilt, O prince among the Brahmans; I shall not keep thee as hitherto." Dīrghatamas spoke: "From this day on the course of law in the world is laid down by me. One husband is for the woman the first thing and the last (parāyaṇa) so long as she lives. Whether he be dead or alive, she shall have no other man. But if a wife goes to another man, then unfailingly she sinks out of her caste. And for unwedded women, too, it is from to-day a crime leading to loss of caste.[3] But if copulation does come about, then all men must give money; the women withal are not to have any profit from the pleasure, but it shall ever be dishonour and shame for

[1] The accus. with *verbis dicendi* in the meaning: of, about is often found in the MBh. (e.g. i, 48.20; 123.14; 124.17; 127.5; 165.6; 167.47, 48; 192.11; 193.12; iii, 61.17; 105.20; 191.50; 294.20; vi, 120.13, 15; vii, 72.23 f.; 155.41; viii, 40.38; ix, 59.20; x, 9.26; xi, 24.21; xii, 156.3; 249.29). Cp. evaṃ taṃ vadati, so he speaks of thee, Jāt., iii, p. 150, l. 14.

[2] The well-known, often-found, etymology: bhāryāyā bharaṇād bhartā pālanāc ca patiḥ smṛitaḥ, that is, from keeping her that must be kept (that is, the wife) he is called the keeper (that is, the husband), and from sheltering, the lord (or husband, given as also = shelterer).

[3] That is, if they copulate, and thereby sin against their future husband.

them." [1] His wife is now overcome with anger, and in obedience to her bidding, the sons bind the blind man onto a raft, and leave him to be carried away by the Gaṅgā. Thus at last he comes into the land of King Bali, who rescues him, and, having heard his story, makes use of him in a way corresponding with the peculiar strength of the holy man and of which we shall hear later. We thus learn, too, from this episode who it is that has prostitution for money—that pillar of shame among mankind—on his conscience.

We are often told that the Madras in north-western India, the Sindhusauvīrakas, dwelling on the Indus, and the Panjāb peoples had an evil reputation among the Brahmans of the post-Vedic age. Even if, indeed, both these views, and Karṇa's words in the Mahābh., which among other things mock at the women and the promiscuity prevailing in these places, are to be perhaps taken with caution, yet it is not impossible that they were not altogether without foundation. "Father and son, mother and mother-in-law, father-in-law and maternal uncle, son-in-law, daughter, brother, nephew, and other kindred, friends, guests, and others, slave-men and slave-women—all pair, one with the other. With the men the women mingle, known or unknown, just as the longing comes on them. How should there be virtue among the befouled [2] Madras, a byword for their unlovely deeds, among these untutored eaters of groats and fish, who drink heady drink in their houses, and with it eat cow's flesh, and then shout and laugh, sing unrhymed rubbish, follow their lusts, and chatter such things at one another as they choose? How should the Madra man speak of virtue, the son of women that throw off their clothes, and so dance, clouded by heady drink, that pair without heed of any barrier, and live as their lusts lead them [3]; that make water standing, like the camel and the ass, have lost seemliness and virtue, and in all things are without shame—the son of such as these, thou wouldst speak here of virtue! If the Madra

[1] The double conditional particle (yadi and ced) also in ix, 27.25, cp. xii, 34.32; 152.6; xiii, 115.3; xiv, 48.2.

[2] Avalipta, probably not "haughty": cp. viii, 44.15.

[3] So, if we read—carāç. According to the text with—varāç: "who woo (themselves) according to their lusts."

woman is asked for sour rice gruel, she shakes her buttocks, and utters—she, infatuated with giving [1]—these dreadful words : ' Let none ask me for my beloved sour rice gruel. My son I would give, my husband I would give, but I would not give sour rice gruel.' Pale-faced (gauryas), big, shameless are the Madra women, clad in woollen wraps, greedy, and usually without cleanliness or neatness. Thus do we hear " (viii, 40).[2] In the forty-fourth canto Karṇa, among many other bitter draughts, knows how to pour out the following for Çalya, the king of those parts (a Brahman brought in by Karṇa speaks) : " The people dwelling between the five ſtreams and the Indus as sixth, these that are outside the law, and also the unclean Bāhīkas, let men shun. . . When the women have taken heady drink of corn and molasses and taken cows' flesh with garlic—they, who eat cakes, flesh, and roaſted barley, and know not the ways of goodness, sing and dance, drunk and unclothed, on the earth-walls of the city and of the houses, without wreaths and unanointed, and amidſt drunken, lewd songs (avagīta) of various kinds, which sound like the noise of asses and camels. They know no bridle [3] in their pairing, and in all things they follow their luſt. They utter fine sayings againſt one another, they, who hold forth maddened by the drink : ' Ho there, ye outcaſts ! Ho, ye outcaſts ! Caſt off by your husband, caſt off by your lord ! ' Screaming, this refuse of women dance at the feſtivals, putting no reſtraint upon themselves. A husband of these foul, evil women of the Bāhīkas, one that dwelt in Kurujāṅgala, sang with but little rejoicing soul : ' She the tall one, the fair (gaurī) one, clad in a thin wool wrap, lies, I know, and thinks of me, the Bāhīka in Kurujāṅgala. When I have crossed the Çatadru and the delightful Irāvatī, and come into my home, then shall I see

[1] Ready to give.

[2] But how can one look for anything better of them ? " They are non-Aryans (barbarians) born in a bad land, who know nothing of the holy laws." The allusion to such people being like the Mlecchas, that is, belonging to the aboriginal population is worthy, however, of notice. Cp. for inſtance, Pargiter, Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, p. 311, and what is there said.

[3] Anāvṛita.

the great-shelled,[1] splendid women, the outward corners of whose eyes[2] shine with red-lead, the light-skinned women anointed[3] with ointment from the mountain of Trikakud, wrapped in woollen cloaks and skins, screaming, fair to look on.'" Then we are further told how the Bāhīkas strengthen themselves with cakes, groats, and butter-milk, and then mishandle and rob the wayfarers, and how their great, light-skinned women devour flesh, and soak themselves with heady drink.[4] In the forty-fifth canto, çl. 11 ff., we are told why the women of the Gāndhāras, Madras, and Bāhīkas are so evil. These tribes or peoples robbed and outraged a good and chaste woman, and she uttered the curse that for this their women would be loose, and they would not be able to be freed from this dreadful evil. Therefore, too, among them it is not the sons,

[1] Çaṅkha is here an expression for vulva, though the dictionaries do not show anything of this kind. In the "gallant" time of German literature also," Muschel" (shell) was used for the woman's pudenda.

[2] Or: forehead marks (apāṅga)?

[3] Cp. Caland, *Die altind. Toten- u. Bestattungsgebräuche*, pp. 123 f. So far as I know this ointment does not seem to be particularly valuable otherwise, and if we take our passage in the Mahābhārata, it was looked on, indeed, as something vulgar. The Hindu, indeed, has often declared that "what mankind eats its gods eat". And yet we know that often only the worthless is dedicated to gods and spirits and their service; they are cheated. Thus, to keep to the dead, these in Old India get fringes of garments to clothe themselves, and have to nourish themselves with only the hot steam of the cakes (Caland, *Altind. Ahnenkult*, 9; 64; 180; the same, *Totenverehrung*, 6). If now what is worse was, in an earlier culture, looked on as altogether excellent, to the supernatural powers it is, as something old, doubly pleasing (cp. Schurtz, *Urgesch. d. Kultur*, 306). When the Indian Aryans learned how to prepare a better drink, the soma was therefore left for the gods. So this ointment which is so highly prized in the ritual of the dead in "pre-Epic" times may also have seemed a thing of excellence to the ritually pure Aryans. K. for trikakudañjanāḥ has the easier reading: gauryas tāḥ kākukūjitaḥ "these mournfully cooing".

[4] Their beloved rice gruel is naturally one such heady drink. Sir Bampfylde Fuller writes that the mountain-tribes make a gruel from a dwarf-rice, that quickly changes to an alcoholic state; even that which has only been boiled a short time before is, he says, a mild intoxicant (*Studies of Indian Life and Sentiment*, p. 152).

but the sisters' sons who inherit.[1] Çalya, who is thus mocked at, asserts, on the other hand, that in the land of Aṅga which is under the rule of Karṇa, they sell their children and wife (xiii, 45.40); and in the Rām. (ii, 30.8; 83.15) we are told that the çailūshas (actors) hand their wife over for others' use, as Manu, viii, 362, also tells us. Neither of these, however, is really a case of hetærism, but they show the man, indeed, as the lord, free and none too tender, of the wife.[2]

[1] Traces of the matriarchate cannot be proved from the Epic. ix, 4.9 gives the list of the dearest kindred: son, brother, sister's son, and uncle on the mother's side; ix, 9.46, likewise: son, brother, grandfather, maternal uncle, sister's son, friend. Cp. vi, 46.2 f. In ix, 5.12 Kṛishṇa's great grief for the dead son of his sister is referred to. But he is also the son of his dearest friend. The relation between mother's brother and sister's son is looked on as naturally a very close one in viii, 7.9 f.; ix, 7.20, 39 too: Çalya has even left his bhāgineya, and is fighting for the Kurus. But the mātula is also often missing where a list of dearest kinsfolk is given. So, for instance, in x, 8.98, 121; xi, 12.7; 16.19, 55; 27.2 f. And that the particularly near relation to the mother's brother does not in itself give any proof of mother-right is stressed by Ed. Meyer, loc. cit., p. 29. According to Hopkins, *Journ. Americ. Orient. Soc.*, xiii, note, pp. 141 f., the importance of the mātula in the MBh. would even be a later phenomenon. See too *Journ. Roy. Asiatic Soc.*, xiii, 139, note, and Jacobi, *Gött. Gel. Anzeig.*, 1899, pp. 882 ff. WZKM, xxiii, 165; Schrader, *D. Indogermanen*, 75, 107. On the other hand the matriarchate is often found among the primitive population of India. Thus according to Dalton among the Pani-Koch the property belongs to the wife, her daughters inherit it, the husband lives with his mother-in-law and must obey her and his wife; if he commits adultery he pays 60 rupees, or is sold as a slave (*Zschr. f. Ethnol.*, vol. v, p. 336). Among the Khasi in the mountains of Assam the matriarchate is found remarkably developed. See Fuller, *Indian Life and Sentiment*, 171–174, and *Anthropos*, iv, 892 f.

[2] The law books make, of actors and singers, the same statements as something which is a matter of course and known to all, and therefore in the case of their wives there is neither the strict prohibition against a man speaking to another's wife or having connection with her, nor does the general principle hold that the husband is not responsible for his wife's debts. For these wives have intercourse elsewhere with the knowledge and will of their lords; these are hidden near by,

In spite of the ill-report, probably not altogether unfounded, as to the loose morals of certain districts, and in spite of occasional passages where utter freedom in things of sex is described as the primitive and as the ideal,[1] there is likewise to be seen in the Epic that earnest and strait view of wedlock which is so often manifested by the Indian ; and in spite of the somewhat curious Indian garb we get a quite modern feeling of pleasure when Yudhishṭhira in xiii, 19 ff. is wrestling with dark doubts : what is marriage, then, really ? Is it a holy and divine thing,

and then naturally come forward to claim the rent of love : they live on their wives. Baudhāyana, ii, 2, 4.3 ; Manu, viii, 362 ; Yājñavalkya, ii, 48. Cp. Kauṭilya (transl.), 252.12 ff. ; 196.7 ff. They are thus like the men of so many peoples, who are overjoyed when a man flirts with their wives, and they can thereby get something out of him. Many examples, for instance, in Finck, passim, and Hartland, especially ii, 120, 127, 129, 203, 205, 208, 215 ff. Cp. *Anthropos*, i, p. 935 ; iv, 619.

[1] It is this very fact, that promiscuity is set before us so persistently as the primitive state, which must be puzzling to the reader. Here we have the sensual and the thinking Hindu : how then could it be but that his glowing passionate love, his boundless, eager fantasy, and his piercing understanding should have led to such thoughts ? Thus, too, the sexual freedom among the more primitive peoples, dwelling around the Indian Aryans and among them, may well have led to the conception that these were indeed the more primitive conditions ; and what is old, is also, to the Hindu, that which is perfection. It should also be borne in mind that among the Uttarakurus, dwelling far to the north, and the people of King " Blue-Black ", dwelling in the farthest south, a love paradise of this kind is to be found. And it is the women that have pleasure and profit from these loose sexual ways, they who compared with men have so little freedom, and according to the Indian view are yet by nature so infinitely more sensual. Here the philosopher has the word. Here and there, anyhow, there may have been in " Epic times ", too, great immorality and hetæristic abominations, it may be, not without the influence of the non-Aryan tribes. The people and culture of India is, indeed, from earliest times, a mixture, ever growing in complexity, of what is Aryan and what is due to the aboriginal population. But this is the exact opposite of " survivals " and memory, of the far past of the Aryans. It is truly Indian to find Bṛihaspati, ii, 28 ff. saying that, in the East, the women practised promiscuity, and that there this was, as the custom of the land, right.

or has it only the practical purpose of begetting, or does it only serve the ends of the lowest sensuality, does it spring from evil powers? So he comes to Bhīshma and asks: "But what is called married duty,[1] O bull of the Bharatas, which first arises at the time of taking the hand of women, how is it with this according to tradition? Does that, which the great seers have called the rule of duty in common, spring from the holy Ṛishis (the compilers of the divine word, of the Veda), or from the god of procreation, or from the demons? Here, so methinks, lurks a great and conflicting doubt. And whatever wedded duty is here on earth, what becomes of it after death? For the dead in heaven,[2] is there still wedded duty? But when one (of the husband and wife) dies first, where stays then the other, tell me, since mankind, the many, partake of divers fruits of their toil, are set to divers work (karman), are going towards divers hells as their destination?[3] 'Women are untrue,' is the verdict of the compilers of the Sūtras.[4] If, now, women are untrue, why does the tradition speak of the duty in common?[5] 'Women are untrue,' so we read, too, in the Veda. Is dharma (duty, order) now here a first (real) term? A metaphorical expression? A rule for a determined case[6]? This seems to me dark and confused, as I ponder on

[1] Sahadharma, the common duty, ordering of life, virtue.

[2] Read svarge for svargo.

[3] All men, especially kings, save those wholly without sin, must go to hell; either they first enjoy in heaven the fruits of their good works, and then in hell those of their evil works, or the other way about. MBh., xviii, 3.12 ff.; Agnipurāṇa, 369.15–18.

[4] According to a saying, which is very often found, giving the list of women's defects and beginning with anṛitam. Translated in Kressler, *Stimmen indischer Lebensklugheit*, p. 31; Böhtlingk, *Ind. Sprüche* [2], 328; cp. my *Hindu Tales*, 256, note.

[5] Because of the falseness of womenfolk one could not even be sure with them of one's own begotten children; as Kshemendra, Darpadalana, i, 15 very well reminds us, no one must be proud of his origin, for none knows indeed who his father is. How then could women take any share in the higher, religious things?

[6] I do not know whether this translation is the right one. K. (50.7) has: dharmo yaḥ pūrviko drishṭa, etc. I would therefore translate: "Is then the dharma (order, system) that one which is looked on as

it ever. Therefore, do thou, O grandfather, thou so deeply wise, unfold this all to me, set beyond doubt according to revelation, and in its wholeness, when, of what kind,[1] and how it was introduced." Bhīshma's answer to these truly hard and intricate questions is, in more ways than one, truly Indian. He tells him as follows: The mighty one in penance, Ashṭavakra, wishes to wed, and woos Suprabhā, without compare on earth for loveliness, the daughter of the Ṛishi Vadānya, distinguished, too, on account of her excellent character and pure life, one who ravishes Ashṭavakra's heart at the first sight like a flower-strewn forest in spring. The Ṛishi says the wooer must go up to the holy north, where Çiva and Umā with their servants do dwell and take their delight, where the periods of the world's ending and the seasons of the year, the periods of men and of the gods, in bodily shape, bring the god their worship; he will at last come into a dark-leaved, glorious forest, and meet with a splendid old woman; then he is to come back home and wed. Ashṭavakra now wanders ever towards the north, reaching, in the Himālaya, Kubera's abode, where he is entertained most splendidly, so that, to the sound of godlike music, he there spends a whole year of the gods.[2] Then he goes on his way and reaches that forest country, which is glorious with

first (that is, procreation)? (Or) eroticism (upacāra)? (Or) the carrying out of the action of divine service? Then Yudhishṭhira would seem to come back to his first thought: Is it (duty) founded by the Ṛishis, that is, for the fellowship in religious and holy life? Or by Prajāpati, that is, for begetting? Or by the demons, that is, for satisfying sensuality? But there is nothing said here of three ways of solemnizing marriage, which have been supposed.

[1] Yādṛiçam "how constituted".

[2] That is, 128,600 human years (see Manu, i, 65 ff.; Mārk.-Pur., xlvi; Vishṇupur., i, 3, etc.). Naturally with the heavenly sounds he did not notice the time going by, any more than, in Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst*, the Monk of Heisterbach (so well known especially through Wolfgang Müller's poem) amid the sweet notes of the small bird—a motive which has a vast number of parallels. Thus the king Raivata with his daughter listens to the song of the Gandharvas in praise of Brahma; an endless time goes by in this, but seems to him like an instant, and when he gets back he finds everything on earth changed. Wilson's Vishṇupurāṇa, vol. iii, pp. 249 ff.

fruits and filled with birds at all times of the year, and a wonderful penitential grove there. Then he sees a magnificent dwelling, surpassing even Kubera's, great mountains of jewels and gold, all kinds of precious stones, flowers from one of the trees of the gods, and other splendours. Seven ravishing maidens, differing in form, welcome the guest, and whichever of them he beholds, each delights him, and he can make no choice of one ; but he bids his heart be still. They lead him up to an old woman who is lying on a couch, decked in magnificent ornaments. He says that they are all to go away, and only the most understanding and passionless one is to stay behind to wait on him. The seven take their leave, and only the old woman stays. But in the night she comes up into his bed, pretending that she is so cold. When she then clasps the Ṛishi, he lies like a log. "This she saw with sorrow, and said : 'Brahman, otherwise than through love, to women there can come no rest and content from the man.[1] I am crazed with love. Love me, her that loves. Be roused, Ṛishi of the Brahmans, unite with me. Take me in thine arms ; I am sore tried with love for thee. For thereby it is, thou that art steeped in virtue, that the fruits of thy work of mortification come into their own ; and the bare sight of them gives a longing.[2] Thou art the lord over

[1] K. reads: Brahmann, akāmakaro 'sti, for which read—karāsti: "Brahman, staunchness of mind (as towards sensuality) arouses displeasure in women," or : "staunchness of mind in the man is of no use to women."

[2] The enjoyment of women is, countless times in Indian literature, praised as the most glorious thing in heaven and on earth, as the one meaning and end of living, or anyhow of the years of youth. The ascetic, too, often sees the love of many and lovely women, shining before him as the goal and reward in the world beyond, or in a future incarnation. Even in grave, deeply ethical writings the like view breaks through. So, for instance, Uvāsagadasāo, § 246 with comment., praises bliss with women as the one happiness, the goal of asceticism ; redemption (mokkho) without it is but a threefold captivity and only it is the Real in the empty world. Indeed, he that is melted together with his beloved in the spell of delight has come into Brahma, into Nirvana (cp. Kuṭṭananīmatam, 558, and my Daçakumārac., pp. 3 and 356, where many further parallels could be given). Copulation, this

all this wealth here, and over me myself. In the entrancing forest we will dally in love together, all divine and human delights we will try. For to the woman there is never anything higher than sexual union with the man ; that is her highest reward. Driven on by love, women live after their own appetites. And so they are not burned, though they walk on hot-glowing sand.' Ashṭavakra spoke : 'To stranger women I never go. By those learned in the text-books of the law the touching of strange women has been declared to be evil. Know, my dear one, that I will wed, I swear it on the truth ; I know nought of the pleasures of the senses ; offspring is here for the sake of the holy dispensation. So I wish through sons to come into the heavenly worlds. My dear one, acknowledge the moral good, and cease.' The woman spoke : 'Neither the god of wind, nor he of fire, nor Varuṇa, nor the other thirty-three gods are so dear to women as the god of love ; for to women the pleasure of love is all. Among thousands of women, nay, among hundreds of thousands, there is to be found only one that is faithful to her husband, if, indeed, one at all. They know not father, family, mother, brothers, husband, or brothers-in-law ; given up to their pleasure, they destroy families, as great rivers destroy their banks.' Once more repelled by the Ṛishi, she exhorted him to stay ; then would his work be done. She bathed[1] and anointed him, and gave him hospitality in the most splendid wise ; thus the night and the next day went by without his noticing it. In the following night she again slipped into bed to him, but he said : 'My dear, my mind does not lean to strange women. Rise, if it please thee, and desist of thine own will.' She answered : 'I am without ties. Thou dost, then, not deal wrongly with righteousness and virtue.'[2] Ashṭavakra spoke : 'There is no being without ties for women, for the fair are tied. The teaching of Prajāpati is this : "Woman is not fit for independence."' The woman spoke :

highest of the five things (paramatattva) leading to perfection, or being as the gods (siddhi), according to the Tantra writings even brings about siddhi and the knowledge of Brahman.

[1] For arriving heroes, guests, etc., to be bathed by women is quite epic in India, too. Cp. Rām., vi, 121.1 ff.

[2] Na dharmacchalam asti te.

'I have an urge to pair, an urge that is pain, O Brahman, and do thou consider my sacrificing love. Thou dost sin against rightness and virtue in that thou scornest me.' Ashṭavakra spoke: 'The divers kinds of vices carry that man away with them, that has given himself up to his lusts. I am ever lord of my soul by my staunchness.[1] Go into thine own bed, my dear one.' The woman spoke: 'With my head I bow, O Brahman; mayest thou bestow favour on me, be thou the refuge of her that is sinking onto the ground. But if thou seest something forbidden in stranger women, then I give myself to thee; take thou my hand. No guilt will fall on thee, that I assure thee on oath. Know that I am free. If there is any wrong withal, then it shall fall onto me. I have set my heart on thee, and am my own lord; enjoy me.' Ashṭavakra spoke: 'How shouldest thou be free? Tell me wherefore. In the three worlds is no woman capable of freedom. The father wards them in childhood, the husband in youth, the son in their old age; for woman there is no freedom.' The woman spoke: 'I have kept maidenly chastity; I am still a maid; of that there is no doubt; make me thy wife; do not repel my yearning.' Ashṭavakra spoke: 'It is with thee as with me, it is with me as with thee (that is, we both are in love, but not with one another).' Must this not of a truth be a test, a hindrance set by that Ṛishi?[2] For that is a wonder beyond measure (what I now suddenly see before me). What is best for me? For it is as a maid in heavenly comeliness that she (the former old woman) has now come to me. But how has she now the most splendid of forms? And how was it that her shape seemed aged? And whence now a maiden's form like this? What else will happen there? Yet will I call up all my strength to keep myself from sexual infidelity. For such infidelity pleases me not. By truth will I win her (the beloved)." He now asked the woman, what all this might mean, and she made acknowledgment: "To strengthen thee did I make this trial. Through thy faithfulness in love (avyutthāna) thou

[1] Or: I am ever lord of my staunchness, it is ever in my grasp.

[2] Less likely: "I would fain know whether it is a (testing) hindrance, and one to be overcome, set by the Ṛishi, and not the truth."

hast won these worlds, thou truly stout and strong one (satya-parākrama). Know thou that I am the protecting goddess of the northern quarter of the heavens. Thou hast now seen the fickleness of woman. Even old women are plagued by the feverish longing for man.[1] Brahma is now content with thee,[2] as also the gods and Indra. And as to the business on which thou, O holy one, didst come hither, sent by the Brahman the father of the maiden, to give thee instruction—that has all been carried through by me. Thou wilt come happily back home, no weariness will come on thee, thou wilt get the maiden, and she will bear a son."[3] Then Ashṭavakra went back home again, related, when questioned by the holy man, what he had gone through, and he (the holy man) said: "Take my daughter, for thou art most highly worthy." He wedded the maiden, and lived with her, full of joy and without sorrow.

This may seem to some extent a curious "education for marriage"; at least, such a thing would hardly be likely to arouse very great pleasure in a wooer, and this answer to a puzzling and tangled question is shadowy enough, indeed. Yet out of this story, by no means friendly towards women, there looks forth a spirit of deep and earnest morality, and a beautiful meaning. It sounds cynical, but it is steeped in the light of an infinitely higher and purer idealism than the seemingly mystical ecstatic lifting of the eyes of the typical knight of western lands, dreaming of his "madonna". In unsullied chastity and truth, and steadfast in both—thus shall the man enter into wedlock with the beloved maiden, urged by religion, not by the lower lust of the senses, and fully aware with himself that the woman is a wavering reed. Thus he will not make too great demands on her, but rather on himself. This may then, too, have an ennobling and strengthening effect on his mate, who as a woman is so susceptible, and the husband may experience untroubled joy with her, as did Ashṭavakra. Marriage,

[1] So Brantôme in his *Dames galantes* has a lengthy dissertation on the theme: Woman never grows old below the girdle.

[2] Holtzmann gives a small section on the relation of Brahma to wedlock, as it is found in the MBh. (ZDMG, 38, p. 184).

[3] Or: "sons". For the whole adventure with the old woman cp. the 61st Jātaka.

therefore, comes from the inspired seers, it is divine, even if men fall behind it—a great and fine thought and of deep truth.[1]

[1] With this ordeal of chastity imposed on the man before marriage cp. Hartland, *Prim. Paternity*, ii, 80–82 ; 90–91 (the last case, however, reminds us rather of the Finnish custom, where the youth and maid lie together by night without consummating the sexual union, which is well known as a feat of Christian and other saints and of medieval love). The law literature in marriage demands from the man not only the like love and faithfulness as from the wife, but also unsulliedness before the wedding. Since the various books of rules for the behaviour of the Indian make complete sexual continence a holy duty of the scholar, and he must enter into wedlock at once after this period of life is over, this insistence on chastity is to be really found in them all. But Yājñavalkya, i, 52 ff. also lays it down expressly that: Without ever having spotted his chastity, thus shall he that is discharged by his teacher take home as wife a young woman *beloved* by him, and that has as yet belonged to no man, is healthy, and so on. And Baudhāy., iv, 1.11 gives this guiding thread : Let a man betroth his daughter as nagnikā to one that has not broken his vow of chastity. For the Brahma marriage particularly, he demands such an unspotted wooer in i, 11, 20.2. Cp. Manu, iii, 2. It is true that a good deal can happen between the consummation of the marriage and a marriage of this kind with a child-bride, as prescribed by some at least of the legal writings. Cp. too R. Schmidt, *Ind. Erotik*[1], pp. 632 ff.—Besides the tale from the MBh. there is Mārkaṇḍeyapur., lxi, 5 ff. : A young Brahman obtains a magic salve for the feet by whose help he covers 1,000 yojanas in one day. In the far-off Himālaya the melting snow washes it off him, he cannot get home again, and an Apsaras falls in love with him. He repels her advances in spite of the loveliness of the heavenly fay : "Dear to me is the hearth, and my beloved wife is my divinity dwelling about me (ramyaṃ mamāgniçaraṇam, devī viśtaraṇī priyā 65). He calls on Agni, who sets him home again in an instant of time. And happiness comes, too, for the poor loving woman : a Gandharva named Kali has long been in love with her, but has never been listened to by her. As she now sits there in her disconsolate abandonment, he takes on the shape of the Brahman and dwells long with her in a thousand joys ; for she suspects nothing of the trick. During union, however, she has always, at the Gandharva's bidding, to shut her eyes ; for at such times and in his sleep he that is magically changed must appear in his true shape, as indeed is seen from the tale of Amor and Psyche (the mark of an Indian origin ?). Cp. Mahāvagga, i, 63 ;

also *Wide Awake Stories*, p. 193; Benfey, *Pantschatantra*, i, p. 254. Perhaps with this there is a connection also of the motive so widely found in the fairy tales of various lands, and in particular so finely treated by William Morris, *The Earthly Paradise*, ii, pp. 164 ff. ("The Lady of the Land")—the motive, namely, that the bewitched human being or spirit gets back his true shape by being kissed or clasped in love. An Indian form, for instance, Mārk.-Pur., lxvi, 13 ff. (a goddess turned into a gazelle is so restored).

III

The Wedding

A LOFTY view of marriage meets us, too, in connection with the wedding ceremony in very many places in the Old Indian marriage ritual. In the Gṛihyasūtras or precepts for the religious side of domestic life there are found, besides much old-inherited superstition, as an ardently sought-for goal, two things particularly : first, the blessing of children,[1] especially a wealth of stout sons ; secondly, cordial relations between husband and wife, rooted in mutual love. Starting with the choice of a bride, that girl, according to a fine verse, often cited, but perhaps seldom followed—stifled, too, among other rules—she shall be chosen towards whom the man's soul feels drawn in joyful inclination, and beside this nothing else must weigh. At the wedding itself there is a whole array of ceremonies and formulas for bringing about a true bond between the hearts ; and Kāma, the god of love, is called upon in the wedding ritual, too. With children and grandchildren playing round them, and with these filled with gladness, the couple hopes to live a hundred autumns in a tender union of souls. This is the ideal handed down from Vedic times, only that in actual life, and also through later growths, it is often darkened.[2] Here let mention only be made

1 "The Hindu only marries to have children, and the more he has the happier he feels. . . . No Hindu would ever dream of complaining that his family was too large, however poor he might be, or however numerous his children." Dubois-Beauchamp, *Hindu Manners*, etc.[3], p. 94, cp. 593.

2 "The keen observer of the inner life of Hindu society will have no difficulty in discerning . . . that the poorest Indian villager loves his wife as tenderly and affectionately as the most refined mortal on earth." Rāmakrishna, *Life in an Indian Village*, p. 100. And so many another Indian. On the other hand another picture is given by S. C. Bose (*The Hindoos as They Are*), who is prejudiced the other way.

of those exquisite verses of the Ṛigveda (x, 85.24), with which the bride is addressed: "I loose thee from the shackles of Varuṇa (the warden of the moral law in the world) by which the kindly Savitar has held thee bound (up to now to thy father's family). Into the womb of the Ṛita,[1] into the world of good works, I set thee, together with thy husband." Descriptions of the wedding as such an important event in the life of the heroic couple are often given, too, in the literary epic poetry, most beautifully perhaps in Kālidāsa's Raghuvaṃça, canto 7. The references, however, in the popular Epic are somewhat scanty.

It is already well known from the Song of Nala and the inserted tale of Sāvitrī that, as on every important undertaking in India, at the wedding, too, a lucky day and prosperous hour was carefully looked for. When Rāma has won Sītā and called his father by messengers, and also the family register has been brought forward by both sides, Janaka, the bride's father, says to Daçaratha that he wishes to give another daughter, Urmilā, to Lakshmaṇa, and goes on to say: "Now the moon stands in Maghā (the tenth house of the moon). On the third day (from to-day), at the time of the moon's house Uttaraphalgunī, hold thou the wedding ceremony. Let the ancestral sacrifice be made, the godāna ceremony[2] be done over Rāma and over Lakshmaṇa, and happiness-bringing gifts be made on their behalf." Viçvāmitra then seeks the two daughters of Janaka's brother in marriage for Bharata and Çatrughna, the younger brothers of Rāma, and it is agreed that the four couples shall be wedded on one day. Daçaratha goes home with the prince, has the Çrāddha or customs of the dead and the godāna rite carried out, gives

[1] The natural and moral law, governing the whole world, and, according to the Indian belief, having its origin and most important centre of life and activity in the family.

[2] Godāna is a sacramental proceeding carried out on the youth's hair in the 16th or 18th year, and described in the Gṛihyasūtras—"giving the family cut to the hair" (Hopkins, JAOS, xiii, p. 109). Çrāddha (this kind is called ābhyudayika) are prescribed for all happy family events. See, e.g. Caland, *Ahnenkult*, p. 100, and especially "Totenverehrung" (among some Indo-European peoples), 36–39.

the Brahmans on behalf of each son 100,000 cows—golden-horned, splendid, blessed with calves, yielding a brass pailful of milk ; 400,000 of the cows, and many other treasures he gives the Brahmans on the occasion of the godāna. On the same day Bharata's uncle on the mother's side comes, having in vain sought for his sister's son in Ayodhyā, and takes part in the festival. Next morning the princes, in full decoration, with the wedding string [1] in hand, then go together with the Ṛishis to the place of sacrifice. Janaka says his daughters are standing in full wedding apparel at the foot of the altar, and so let all be carried out forthwith. " Vasishṭha set up the altar in a shed (prapāmadhye), took sweet-smelling flowers, golden cooking-pots (suvarṇapālikā), and coloured pitchers, which were all furnished with shoots of trees, as also earthen platters (çarāva) decked with shoots, incense-pans with perfumes, shell-shaped vessels,[2] and great and small sacrificial spoons, and vessels holding the water for guests ; further, dishes filled with roasted corn, and unhusked corn laid out ; and he decked the altar round with these things. Vasishṭha, having strewn darbha-grass about according to the precept, and to the recitation of holy words, lighted the flame on the altar and made sacrifice in the fire. Then Janaka led up Sītā adorned with every kind of ornament, set her before the fire, facing Rāma, and now spoke to Kauçalyā's son : ' This is Sītā, my daughter, thy wife. Take her, I beg ; take her hand with thy hand. As faithful wife she, the one favoured of happiness, follows thee evermore as thy shadow.' After these words the king poured the water, consecrated with holy sentences, on Rāma's hand. The same holy rites were then repeated with the other pair. All walked to the right thrice

[1] It is of wool (Raghuvaṃça, xvi, 87) and red (Mālatīmādhavam, v, 18).

[2] Thus according to the dictionaries. But perhaps : vessels with shells. Shells, like water-filled pitchers, shoots, gold, etc., bring luck. See my note Samayamātṛikā, ii, 7 (p. 12) ; Kuṭṭanīmatam, p. 12, n. 1 ; Toru Dutt, *Ballads and Legends of Hindusthan*, pp. 55, 56 ; Edgar Thurston, *Omens and Superstitions of Southern India* (London, 1912), p. 111 ; Rajendralala Mitra, *Indo-Aryans*, i, p. 288 ; Caland, *Altind. Toten- u. Bestattungsgebr.*, 151.

round the fire, the king, and the Ṛishis. Next morning Janaka gave his daughters their dowries (kanyādhana) : many hundreds of thousands of cows, magnificent cloths, linen garments and 10,000,000 dresses, elephants, horses, chariots, and foot soldiery, all of heaven-like stature and well equipped, also a hundred girls, fine men and women slaves, worked and unworked gold, pearls, and coral. Then all went home" (Rām., i, 70 ff.). In Mahābh., iv, 72 the wedding of Abhimanyu, Arjuna's son, with Uttarā, the daughter of the king Virāṭa is celebrated with great pomp. Shells, trumpets, drums blare out,[1] all kinds of beasts are slaughtered in hundreds, divers kinds of heady drinks are plentifully drunk ; singers and tale-tellers, dancers and praise-utterers take their share in giving glory to the festival, bands of lovely, splendidly decked women take part and engirdle the shining bride. Her father bestows on the Pāṇḍava, probably for his son, seven thousand steeds swift as the wind, two hundred thoroughbred elephants, and many things besides ; and Kṛishṇa likewise a great number of precious things, such as women, jewels, dresses. Yudhishṭhira naturally shows himself on this occasion, too, as a true god of blessings for the Brahmans.

i, 198 f. is more important. Vyāsa exhorts Yudhishṭhira : "To-day the moon goes into the house of Pushya ; to-day be thou the first to take Kṛishṇā's hand." Her father has her brought up, she having been bathed and decked with many jewels. Full of joy the prince's friends come, the state counsellors, the Brahmans, and the leading burghers, to witness the wedding. The palace shines with people and precious stones. The court is decked with strewn lotus-flowers. The five youths draw nigh in festal attire, with rings in their ears, clad in fine garments, sprinkled with sandal-water, bathed, consecrated by happiness-bringing ceremonies. Together with their sacrificial priest they come in. The priest makes the fire, sacrifices amid holy hymns (mantra), and unites Yudhishṭhira with Kṛishṇā. To the right he has the two led round, who have taken one

[1] Din and music are well known to be held by the Indians, indeed, to be very powerful in scaring away demons and bringing good luck. Cp. too Winternitz, *Das altind. Hochzeitsrituell*, 30.

another by the hands. In the same way the four other brothers, too, are then joined in wedlock with Draupadī. After the wedding the bride's father bestows enormously rich gifts.[1] And the linen-clad Kṛishṇā, with the wedding-string fastened to her, was greeted by her mother-in-law; and with bowed body, her hands folded before her forehead, she stood there. To Draupadī, her daughter-in-law, gifted with loveliness and happiness-yielding bodily features, endowed with virtuous ways, to her spoke Pṛithā in tender love the words: "As Indrāṇī towards the god with the yellow steeds (Indra), as Svāhā towards the brightly-shining one (Agni), as Rohiṇī towards the god of the moon, as Damayantī towards Nala, as Bhadrā towards Kubera, as Arundhatī towards Vasishṭha, as Lakshmī towards Vishṇu—so be thou towards thy husbands, a bearer of stout, long-lived children, a bearer of heroes, endowed thou with much good fortune, beloved by thy husband, fully gladdened with delights, disposing of sacrifices, and faithful to thy husband. May ever the years find thee, as they go by, honouring, as is seemly, guests and new-comers, the good and those that thou shouldst heed, old and young. In the kingdoms, first among which is Kurujāṅgala, and in the cities be thou dedicated to the king as 'wealth of virtue' (as queen to Yudhishṭhira). The whole earth, conquered by thy stout husbands with valiant heroes' strength, do thou make over to the Brahmans at the horse sacrifice, the great offering. Whatever surpassing jewels there be on earth, O thou that art gifted with excellences, win them for thine, O lovely one, and be happy through a hundred autumns. And as I greet thee linen-clad to-day, O daughter-in-law, so will I with far greater joy greet thee, O thou gifted with excellences, when thou hast borne a son."

Likewise when Arjuna wedded Kṛishṇa's sister, Kṛishṇa made magnificent gifts. "To them (the Pāṇḍavas) Kṛishṇa, he in high renown, gave very great wealth because of the

[1] A hundred slave-girls in the first bloom of youth are among the treasures bestowed by Drupada on each of the five Pāṇḍavas. Cp. also v, 192.31; i, 199.13 f. As Kshattriyas are here concerned, the Rājput custom may also be compared, by which at the wedding the bridegroom's every wish, whatever it is, must be fulfilled by the girl's father. Tod, *Rajasthan*, i, 526.

kinship through marriage,[1] the marriage-portion (haraṇa) of Subhadrā, the gift to the kinsfolk. A thousand chariots with golden fittings, wreathed in numberless bells, four-horsed, with skilled and tried drivers, did the glorious Kṛishṇa give, and a myriad of cows from the neighbourhood of Madhurā, rich in milk, shining fair. And a thousand thoroughbred[2] mares, that shone there like the moon's (white) beam, and were decked with gold, Janārdana gave out of love, as also, to each, five hundred[3] well-trained, wind-swift, black-maned white she-mules.[4] A thousand women the lotus-eyed one gave (them)—light-skinned,[5] clad in fair raiment, shining splendidly, decked with hundreds of gold ornaments on their necks, free of body-hair, well cared for, and skilled to serve, skilful at the bath, at the drinking, and at festivals, and endowed with youth. And a hundred thousand saddle-horses from Bāh'i did Janārdana give (Subhadrā), as an all-surpassing morning-gift (kanyādhana), and of the best worked and unworked gold, gleaming like fire,

[1] Janyārthe. I do not know whether janya can altogether have this meaning, not given in the dictionaries. The translation might also be: for the newly wedded wife (janyā). According to Nīl. the meaning is: he gave to them for those made kin by marriage, as to these kin by marriage.

[2] Or: faultless.

[3] That is, 500 for each of the brothers. Literally: "five and five hundred." Is it then rather: a thousand (in all)?

[4] As the ass, indeed in the East is often a big, fine, nimble beast, so in the Indian Epic, too, he is usually looked on as swift and valuable (i, 144.7, 18; ii, 51.19, 20, 25; xiii, 27.9; Rām., ii, 70.23). The mule, especially the she-mule is seen as being still swifter and more highly prized (i, 221.48; iii, 192.51; v, 86.12; viii, 38.5 ff.; xiii, 66.3; 93.31; 103.10; 118.13 ff.). A chariot harnessed to especially swift she-mules travels fourteen yojanas a day (v, 86.12). The "Epic" yojana, therefore, cannot be either 9 or 10 or 7½ English miles, but probably only about 2 to 3 (hardly 4 or 5). Cp. note 5 in my *Twice Told Tales* (Chicago, 1903).

[5] Or: splendid (gaurī)? According to the schol. = that have not yet menstruated, and so also he explains aroma "in whom the line of hair (so highly praised by the poets) above the navel has not yet sprouted". On this charm of the woman see my translation of Dāmodaragupta's Kuṭṭanīmatam, p. 10.

loads for ten men. But Rāma, the plough-bearer (Kṛishṇa's elder brother Baladeva), the lover of pert, bold deeds, joyfully gave Arjuna as wedding-gift (pāṇigrahaṇika), to honour the union, a thousand rutting elephants, streaming three-fold rutting-sap,[1] like unto mountain-tops, and fleeing not in the battle, harnessed, hung with loud-ringing bells, splendid, wreathed with gold, furnished with drivers" (i, 221.44 ff.).[2] According to the commentary, Rām., 39.2 and 66.4 alludes to a custom not without its charm: at the wedding of Sītā with Rāma her father takes a jewel out of (or, from ?) the hand of her mother and hands it to the father of her bridegroom for the latter to fasten it on her as a head-ornament.

[1] At the sides of the head, the roots of the ears, and the genitals. Cp. i, 151.4; vi, 64.58; 116.56. But saptadhā sravan in vi, 95.33, as repeatedly in the literature elsewhere.

[2] So we see, that when the girl flies out of the father's nest, then plenty of golden birds fly out at the same time from the purse (or, to speak as the Old Indians, out of the money-knot) of her father. So it is among the Turks (Osmani Bey, *Die Frauen i. d. Türkei*, Berlin, 1886, pp. 49–50, 54, 70). It is well known that to marry off daughters in India often means to ruin the family, and even down to the children and children's children.

IV

Life in Marriage

WHEN now the woman is married, how does her life in marriage go on? What is expected of her? What is granted her? The first purpose of woman is the bearing of offspring. In a quite wholesome, if often exaggerated stressing of this great task in life of the woman, the Epic agrees with the rest of the literature.[1] In addition to the well-known reasons more or less active almost all over the world, which set such extraordinary importance on offspring, and that usually male offspring, there are especially in India religious ones, too: the son must make the sacrifices for the dead to his fathers which are absolutely necessary for their welfare in the other world. He saves them from an existence in hell or among ghosts, and leads them to heaven. Thus marriage is necessary for both sexes.[2]

[1] This view, indeed, is the more or less prevailing one throughout the world. For the woman, cursed already through her very sex, the son is atonement and reconciliation. To give one example only, and that from a Christian people: among the Armenians the young wife must not even speak, except with her husband, until she has borne a son (Lucy M. J. Garnett, *The Women of Turkey and Their Folk Lore*, London, 1893, i, p. 241; Schweiger-Lerchenfeld, *Die Frauen d. Orients*, 440). From the Indian law literature only Nārada, xii, 19; Manu, ix, 96 will be mentioned.

[2] We can read, for instance, in Westermarck [3], 136 ff. and Ploss-Bartels [4], ii, 285 ff. how absolutely necessary marriage is looked on by the various peoples and tribes. Here we give only one further example: ‘“When a servant (of God),” said the Prophet, “marries, verily he perfects half of his religion.” He once asked a man, “Art thou married?” The man answered, “No.” “And art thou,” said he, “sound and healthy?” The answer was, “Yes.” “Then,” said Mohammed, “thou art one of the brothers of the devils; for the most wicked among you are the unmarried, and the most vile among your dead are the unmarried; moreover, the married are those who

An impressive legend meant to show this is told more than once in the Mahābhārata. The great penitent Jaratkāru goes throughout the world, living by the wind, dried up, bathing at holy places. Then one day he sees hunger-racked, emaciated, woeful beings hanging head down in a cave, clinging to a bunch of the *Andropogon muricatus* plant, which itself holds on only by a thread, which is furthermore being greedily gnawed at by a mouse. All the other roots have been already bitten through by it. Moved by pity, he asks the wretched creatures: "Who are ye? When the mouse has gnawed through this one root, then ye will fall headlong down. What can I do for you unhappy ones? I will give you a fourth, a third, or the half of what I have earned by penance, or even the whole of it, to save you." "Thou art old, and livest in chastity, but our sore plight cannot be altered by asceticism. We ourselves have penitential fruits. It is through the lack of offspring that we are falling into the unclean hell. For to beget offspring is the highest duty and virtue, so Brahma has said. While we hang here thus, there is no glimmer of consciousness in us; therefore we know thee not, whose manly prowess is famous in the world. We are the race of the Yāyāvaras, Ṛishis of strict piety, sunk down hither from a pure and holy world through the lack of offspring. Our mighty asceticism is lost, for we have no thread of family left. One man there is, indeed, for us unhappy ones, but he is as good as wanting; for this fatal one does but give himself up to asceticism; Jaratkāru is the name of the famous knower of the Vedas and the Vedāṅgas. By him we have been set in this awful plight because of his greed for strength by penance. He has neither wife nor child, nor any kinsman. Therefore do we hang in the cave, robbed of consciousness. The mouse is time, which now having gnawed through all our other family threads, is fastening its teeth, too, into the last: into that simple, mad Jaratkāru, who yearns only after asceticism. Look how we have come down to the depths

are acquitted of filthy conversation; and by Him in whose hand is my soul, the devil hath not a weapon more effective against the virtuous, both men and women, than the neglect of marriage." ' Lane, *Arabian Society in the Middle Ages*, London, 1883, p. 221; Garnett, *Women of Turkey*, ii, 480.

like evil-doers; and when we have fallen down together with all our kindred, then he, too, will go unto hell. Penitence, or sacrifice, or whatever other mighty means of purification there is, all these are not to be set by the side of continuing the family. If thou seest him, tell him what thou hast seen, that he may take a wife and beget sons. But who then art thou to pity [1] our race, the race of his kindred, like thine own race and as if a kinsman?" In a voice choked with tears, Jaratkāru spoke: "Ye are my forbears: fathers and grandfathers. *I* am Jaratkāru, your sinful son. Punish me, an evil-doer without nobility of soul!" "What a happiness that thou shouldst have chanced to come into this neighbourhood, O son! And wherefore hast thou taken no wife?" "In my heart was ever this one purpose, to bring my body in full chastity into that other world. But since that I have seen you hanging like birds, my mind has now turned away from fleshly continence. I will do what ye so strongly wish, and settle down to domestic life, if I find a maiden having the same name with me, who is offered me of her own accord as a gift, and whom I have not to support. But not otherwise. The child that is born to us shall save you. Eternal and knowing no decay shall my forefathers remain."

But no one would give his daughter to the old man. Filled with despair, thrice he then cried out in the wilderness: "I ask for a maiden. All beings that here dwell shall hear me. My forbears are in dreadful torment, and drive me on to marriage." Then he made known his conditions. The servants of the snake spirit Vāsuki told their lord of the matter, who brought him his sister, who bore the same name as the penitent, and the prince of snakes furthermore promised that he himself would support and protect them; and the last condition—that nothing unpleasing was to be done to the difficult ascetic, otherwise he would leave his wife—was agreed to; and so he dwelt with his young wife in great splendour in the palace of Vāsuki, the prince of the snakes, and begot a son.[2]

Of Jaratkāru this tale is told twice: in i, 45 f., and in a version somewhat shorter, in part agreeing literally, in i, 13.10 ff.

[1] Read: bandhur iva, as in 13.21.

[2] Why the prince of the snakes is so complaisant is shown especially in i, 38, 39.

On the other hand the celebrated holy man Agaśtya appears as the hero in the condensed account in iii, 96.14 ff. When this Ṛishi then wishes to wed, he sees no woman worthy of him. Therefore from various creatures he takes the finest parts, and forms, correspondingly, an incomparable female being, whom he gives as a daughter to the king of Vidarbha, who is leading an ascetic life to obtain offspring. Lopamudrā is her name. At the prince's court she grows up to unheard of loveliness, and when she has come to marriageable age, she is surrounded by a hundred fair-decked maidens, and a hundred slave-girls ; but through fear none dares to sue for her. Through her form, that outshines even the Apsarases, and her virtuous ways she rejoices her father (that is, her foster-father) and her kinsfolk. But gloomy thoughts come on the king, as he asks himself to whom he shall marry her. Then Agaśtya comes, and desires her. The prince cannot refuse him, but neither has he any wish whatsoever to marry her to him. At a loss he complains to his wife that if the Ṛishi is angered by anyone, he will burn him with the fire of his curse. Then the daughter comes to her troubled parents and speaks : " Give me to him and save thyself through me." And so it comes about.[1]

Pāṇḍu in i, 120.15 ff. bewails his sorrow to the holy men : " For him that has no offspring no door to heaven is known or is named ; this torments me. I am not free of my debt towards my forbears. When my life is at an end, then it is the end of my fathers. Men are born on earth with four kinds of duty : towards the forefathers, the gods, the Ṛishis, and mankind, and to them the debt must be paid according to the holy law. But for those that do not look to this debt at the fitting time, for them are no worlds of heaven ; thus have those learned in the law laid it down. It is through sacrifices that the gods are appeased, the Munis through the study of the

[1] Cp. with this legend Bhandarkar, *Ninth Internat. Congress of Orientalists*, vol. i, p. 426 ; and the tale how his forefathers appear to the ascetic Ruci, who has never taken a wife, upbraid him, and remind him of his duty to beget a son ; and how through their power he gets Mālini, the daughter of an Apsaras, as wife. Mārk.-Pur., xcv f. ; Garuḍapur., 88–90.

Vedas (composed by the Ṛishis) and through asceticism, the fathers through sons, through gifts to forbears, and mankind through benevolent charity." And in v, 118.7 f. Gālava speaks to King Uçīnara: "Thou art childless; beget two sons. In the boat of 'son', ferry thy forefathers and thee thyself over to the other shore. For he that partakes of the fruit of sons is not cast down from heaven, nor does he go to the dreadful hell like the sonless." So vii, 173.53, 54 teaches: "For men yearn for sons to this end: Who shall save us from sorrow? For their own good do fathers yearn after sons, who with friendly hearts bring them salvation from out of this world in that beyond." Sadly speaks Pāṇḍu to Kuntī (i, 120.28–30): "Offspring, indeed, is the abiding-place in the worlds that concords with the law. I have sacrificed, given alms, practised asceticism, thoroughly carried out vows of mortification, but all this, it is declared, does not purge the childless man of sin. I, a childless man, shall not reach the pure, fair worlds." Here belongs ii, 41.27, 28: "To make offerings to the gods, to give alms, to study the holy writings, and to sacrifice with abundant sacrificial gifts, all this is not worth a sixteenth part so much as offspring. Whatever he brings about with many vows and much fasting, all is fruitless for the childless man." So in i, 100.67–69: "The sacrifice in fire, the three Vedas, and the propagation of the family are everlasting. All of them (that is, of the other things) are not worth a sixteenth part of offspring.[1] So it is among mankind, and just so among creatures. Thus it is. What is called offspring, *that* it is which is the threefold Veda of the ancients, and of the godheads that

[1] According to the comment., however, as also according to the printed text: "The fire-sacrifice and the propagation of the threefold wisdom (of the threefold Veda), which indeed are everlasting, all these," etc. Cp. i, 74.64. The three things named in the text are the "threefold debt" which is very often found in the Veda and then later; that is, everyone owes sacrifices to the gods, gifts for the dead to the forefathers, Veda study to the Ṛishis. MBh., xii, 28.55; 63.20; 234.7; 269.16; Manu, ii, 36; Vishṇu, xxvii, 15–17; Yājñav., i, 14; Baudhāyana, ii, 9, 16.4–7; Vasishṭha, xi, 48, and Bühler's note to it SBE, xiv, p. 56.

which lasteth for ever." [1]—" Three are the lights which man has on earth : children, deeds, knowledge " (ii, 72.5 ; and K., i, 107.73) ; and as a rule of life we find in xiii, 68.34 : " Let a man wed and beget sons, for in them there is a profit greater than any other profit." The sonless man was born to no end (iii, 200.4 f.), and he that does not propagate himself is godless (adharmika) ; for to carry on the blood is the highest duty and virtue (xii, 34.14).[2] As is well known, therefore, for the Indians the birth of a son is looked on as the greatest happiness on earth. From the Epic we will take only one saying about this, and it we take because of the nobility of soul shown there : " The gift of a kingdom, the birth of a son, and the saving of a foe from a danger—these three are one and the same thing " (iii, 243.13 ; v, 33.67). The son is the very self of his begetter in many meanings of that word, born anew from his wife, as we so often read in Indian literature, and also, for instance, in iii, 313.71 ; xiv, 81.20 ; 90.63.

Therefore, and quite logically, of the four stages of the Indian earthly pilgrimage, the condition of father of the family is over and over again declared as the best and highest—a rank for which it undoubtedly has mainly to thank the fact that with this condition the priestly caste, depending on charity, stands and falls. And the Epic, naturally, often is found in agreement with this. So, for example, xii, 295.39 ; xiv, 44.17 ; 45.13 ; xii, 234.6 ; 12.6 ; i, 2.390. Cp. xii, 64.6 ; 66.15, etc.

Nay, just as in the old Upanishad, life itself with its pains and sorrows is called tapas (asceticism), so the Mahābh. proclaims the condition of father of the family, family life, to be tapas [3]

[1] According to the Gṛihyasūtras the father thus solemnly speaks to his scion : " Thou art named the Veda, (thou art named) son ; O live a hundred autumns ! "

[2] And so the man that has died childless becomes an evil, harmful ghost. Garuḍapur., Pretakalpa (ed. Çrīveṅkaṭeçvara-Press, Bombay, 1906) 9.56–62 ; 11.4–10 ; 20.4–47 ; 21.1 ff. ; Crooke, *Popular Relig. and Folk-Lore of Northern India.* New ed. ii, 77, cp. what follows ; Schmidt, *Liebe u. Ehe in Indien*, 475.

[3] Life itself or its sorrow appears as tapas also in xiv, 35.32, and cleansing through suffering in vii, 78.30 ; for there Subhadrā bewailing her fallen son names in a long formula of blessing the

(xii, 66.23 ; 269.7 ; and especially 11) : "Here they tell this old tale, the words of Indra with the penitents. . . . Some Brahmans left their house and went into the forest ; before their moustache had grown, the foolish ones, who sprang from good families, became ascetics. This is the 'good' (dharma), they thought, who were rich and practised chastity, and left brother and father. On them Indra took pity. The sublime one spoke to them, having changed himself into a golden bird : 'Hard unto men is that which is done by the devourers of the remains of food. It is a holy deed, and a praiseworthy life. They have reached their goal, having come onto the most excellent path, they, given up to virtue.' The Ṛishis spoke : 'Listen now ! This bird is praising the devourers of the remains of food. He is, of a surety, praising us ; we too are devourers of the remains of food.' The bird spoke : 'It is not ye, the fools that devour dirt-coated, dusty[1] refuse that I praise ; of a truth the devourers of the remains of food are others.' The Ṛishis spoke : 'This is the highest good (çreyas), so we think, and give ourselves up to it. Speak, O bird, what is the "good", we have great trust in thee.' The bird spoke : 'If ye do not split yourselves up into yourselves, and put doubt into me, I will speak to you according to the truth, wholesome words.' The Ṛishis spoke : 'We hearken to thy words, the paths are known unto thee. And we will cling to thy precept, thou that art informed by virtue ; teach us.' The bird spoke :

çokāgnidagdhās, too, as among the noblest and holiest men to whose world the dead man shall go. A parallel to this is to be found in the *Wigalois* of Wirnt von Grafenberg : the Mohammedan woman Jafite from grief for her husband has died by his body. The poet prays God to show her his grace for : "Her baptism was the sorrow she suffered for her love." But, probably, that Wolfram so greatly admired by Wirnt, together with *Parzifal*, i, 824 ff., was here the pattern. Cp. too my note to Dāmodaragupta's Kuṭṭanīmatam, 297 (p. 44). Tapas is also the work in life (iii, 33.72 ; cp. 313.88 ; the Bhagavadgītā ; Manu, xi, 236), and according to MBh., xii, 263.27 it is the service of God (yajña, sacrifice)—both of which are thoughts which Luther, as before him Berthold von Regensburg, preached so magnificently. That marriage is self-denial, purgatory, etc., is also an utterance of the people in various places.

[1] Or : filled with passion ?

'It is among the four-footed that the cow is best, among the metals (loha) gold, among the sounds the holy saying (mantra), among the two-footed the Brahman. The holy saying is for the Brahman, so long as he lives, according to the time, a precept from the holy customs, directly after birth unto the end on the field of the dead.[1] The Vedic deeds are for him the unsurpassable path to heaven. Hence they (the holy men of early ages) have so contrived that all deeds have their perfection and effect in the mantras. He that holds his own stoutly—it is thus that success is won on earth, so it is assumed.[2] The months and half-months, the seasons of the year, sun, moon, and stars—all beings strive after what is known as action (karma). This is the holy field where success grows, this is the great occupation in life (āçrama). Therefore does a debt of sin rest on the blinded, aimless men who dispraise action, and walk on an evil path. The deluded ones live betraying the various divisions of the gods, of the forefathers, and of the Brahmans, these the ever enduring; therefore do they go along a path that belongs not to the holy revelation.[3] Let that be the fitting tapas for you, which says: I give; that the seers have straitly enjoined. Therefore is endurance in this very thing called the asceticism (tapas) of the rich in asceticism. The dividing oneself among the bands of the gods, the bands of the Brahmans, and the bands of the forefathers, the ever enduring, and the service of the gurus [4] (that we should let each one of these have his share)—this, of a truth,

[1] Read nidhanād abhi? K. here also smooths things and has nidhanāntakaḥ. Abhi with the ablat. = "hither from" is found in xii, 8.23 (adhi with ablat. = "from", v, 55.47). Since now ā with ablat. means "from" and "until", my proposed emendation perhaps has a good deal to be said for it.

[2] Or: striven after. I read: atha te instead of katham me. K. offers the unattractive: atha sarvāṇi karmāṇi mantrasiddhāni cakshate Amnāyadṛiḍhavādini, tathā siddhir iheshyate. Ātmānaṃ ḍṛiḍhavādin, liter.: he that stoutly addresses the self, or, that declares the self as firm.

[3] Or: they go (after death) the path of forgetfulness, that is, they are born again as low beings; or: their name and memory fades out.

[4] Guru is father, mother, husband, teacher, etc.

is called the heavy task. The gods have performed this heavy task, and so have reached the highest place of power ; therefore I declare unto you that it is a hard thing to live for the condition of father of the family. For this root of beings is the highest tapas, of that is no doubt. For everything has its existence in it through this family order. This tapas was known to the unenvying Brahmans, set above all dissension ; therefore the midway duty of life (that standing between the Brahmans and the hermit's duty) is called tapas among men. And those that eat the remains come to places in heaven hard to win, having at morning and evening shared out, as is seemly, food among their dependants. Devourers of the remains of food are called those that eat what is left, after having given to the guests, the gods, the forbears, and their own folk. Therefore, if they fulfil their duty, are pious, and speak the truth, they become gurus of the world, and without stain. These unselfish men, that do hard deeds, come into the paradise of Indra, and dwell years everlasting in the world of heaven ' "—This the brothers then took to their hearts, went back home and took wives.[1]

[1] With this tale compare Jātaka No. 393. The demand that the wife and servants shall eat first is often made in the MBh., too, but is well known to be in sharp contrast with the Indian custom. Also the law literature lays down : First the master of the house must feed pregnant women, maidens, women under his protection, children, old men, servants, etc., and then last of all may he (or : he and his wife) eat. See Baudhāyana, ii, 7.19 ; Gautama, v, 25 ; Āpast., ii, 2, 4.11–13 ; ii, 4, 9.10 ; Yājñav., i, 105 ; Vasishṭha, xi, 5 ff. ; Manu, iii, 114–116. Moreover, Manu, iii, 114 = Vishṇu, lxvii, 39 declares that the master of the house must feed, even before his guests, an unwedded or newly-betrothed maiden, a sick and a pregnant woman. Cp. Kauṭilya (transl.), 3.13, and above all J. J. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschriften*, 271 f. Mahānirvāṇatantra, viii, 33 lays it down very strongly that, even if he were at the last gasp, he must not eat before he has satisfied mother, father, son, wife, guest or brother. On the other hand, Vasishṭha, xii, 31 (this being according to Çatapathabrāhmana, x, 5, 2.9) gives the warning that if a man eats together with his wife, his sons will be without manly power. In the same way Gaut., ix, 32 ; Manu, iv, 43 ; Yājñav., i, 131 ; Vishṇu, lxviii, 46, forbid eating in the company or the presence of the wife. Baudhāyana, i, 1, 2.1 ff. describes it as a usual, and therefore there, but there only, a good custom in

How utterly needful for woman marriage is, we have already been told ; and ix, 52 makes a parallel to the tale of the forefathers hanging in the cave. The Ṛishi Kuṇivarga, mighty through penance, begot from his mind a daughter, and then went into heaven. Though he wanted to give away the fair-browed, lotus-eyed one in marriage, she would not. She saw no men that were worthy of her as a husband. " With ſtrenuous asceticism she racked her own body, found her delight in the lonely foreſt in worshipping her forefathers and the gods, and believed as she ſtrove, that she had done all that was her duty. When, worn out by age and asceticism, she could not walk another ſtep by herself, she resolved to go unto the other world. But when (the heavenly Ṛishi) Nārada saw that she wished to caſt off her body, he spoke : ' How should the worlds of heaven be open to thee, the sacramentally unconsecrated (that is, unwedded) maiden ! Thus have I heard in the world of the gods. Thou haſt won the higheſt penitential merit, but not the worlds of heaven.'" Now she promised the half of the fruits of her asceticism to him who should take her hand. The Ṛishi Prākçṛiṅgavant took her to wife ; and she changed for a night into a wonderful and glorious young girl, and lay with him. Next morning she left the wrapping of the body, and went into heaven. Deeply the Ṛishi sorrowed over his short happiness with the enchanting one, but he had, indeed, the half of her penitential merit at his free disposal ; so he followed her into heaven, drawn by her loveliness. The end and reward of woman is this indeed : the pleasures of love and children (she is ratiputraphalā, ii, 5.112 ; v, 39.67) and the barren wife is worthless (xii, 78.41). Nay, what a childless woman (aputrikā) looks on, that the gods and forbears will not accept at the sacrifice, for it is ſtained (xiii, 127, 13,14) ;

the south for the man to eat with his wife. And Nārada enjoins that he shall quickly drive out of the house a woman that eats before her husband, as also the woman who is always doing evil to him, or being unfriendly to him (xii, 93). The reason of the prohibition will be found in J. J. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, 12 ; 369, note. Āpaſtamba, ii, 4, 9.11 says : The father of the family may ſtint himself and his in food, but not the slave that works for him.

and the gifts that are made by a woman without husband and children, rob the receiver of his life-powers (xii, 36.27).[1]

From the Song of Nala we know already that barren marriages were to be found in Old India, too, and "in the best families", indeed, oftenest of all in them; and that this mishap was very sorely felt. And the Epic, too, has a whole set of tales of how in a particular case the evil was at last overcome. As the universal remedy, in this case likewise, asceticism, of course, is efficacious. "Sons, that bring much happiness, are won by fathers through tapas, the practise of chastity, truth, and patience. Mothers win a fruit of their body through fasting, sacrifice, vows, holding festivals, and luck-bringing things, and carry it ten months in the womb; and then these poor ones think to themselves: Will they be safely born, or keep alive, or, when they have been brought up and are strong, bring us joy in this world and the other (xii, 7.13 ff.). Cp. iii, 205.18 ff.; xii, 150.14. Among the most efficacious things, too, handed down from of old is magic of every kind; and, indeed, in India there is no essential difference between worship of the gods and witchcraft. It is significant that mantra can denote a song filled with characteristic depth of thought, or a nobility of heart truly raised above this earth, and also a magic spell, of an evil that out-devils the Devil. Spells against barrenness are to be found, for instance, in Weber's *Ind. Studien*, v, 23 f.; and a witches' ceremony in Pāraskara-Gṛihyasūtra, i, 13. Schmidt, *Erotik*, 891.

The Epic likewise naturally knows of magic for this end, or at least what is bound up with magic. The well-known fruit of the tree [2] is found in ii, 17.18 ff. Bṛihadratha, the king

[1] In the belief of to-day the Yamunā (Jumna) is not wedded, and therefore many will not drink its unclean water. Crooke, *Popul. Relig.*, etc., i, 36 f. And among the Nambutiri the marriage ceremony must be done over the body of an unwedded girl. Dubois-Beauchamp [3], pp. 16–17.

[2] Cp. Chauvin, vi, 84; vii, 84; Hartland, *Prim. Pat.*, i, 4 ff.; Fr. v. d. Leyen in *Herrigs Archiv*, Bd. 114, p. 14; Bd. 115, p. 12, and the quotations there; Crooke, *Pop. Relig.*, etc., i, 225 ff., and the evidence there; further Tod, *Rājasthan*, i, 612; Reitzenstein, *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.*, Bd. 41 (1909), p. 665; Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes*, i, 305; etc.

of Magadha, wedded the two lovely twin-daughters of the prince of Kāçi. "While he lay sunk in sensual enjoyment, his youth [1] went by him, and no son, no upholder of the line was born to him. With luck-bringing things (maṅgala), many fiery sacrifices, and smaller offerings aimed at a son, the best of the herdsmen of men yet got no son to carry on the family." Then in despair he went off with his wives into the penitential forest.[2] One day he there heard that the great ascetic Caṇḍakauçika had happened to come thither, and was sitting by a tree. Together with his wives he waited on him [3] with most earnest feelings. The rejoiced penitent told him to choose a favour for himself." Then Bṛihadratha bowed low and spoke unto him, his voice choked with tears, for he despaired of seeing a son: "O glorious and holy man, I have forsaken a kingdom, and have come into the penitential forest. What could I, an unhappy man do with a favour, what should I, a childless man, do with a kingdom!" Moved to sorrow by these words, the holy man took his seat under a mango-tree. Then there fell onto his lap a juicy mango-fruit that no parrot had pecked at.[4] This he wrapped with mantras, speaking

[1] Read: atyagāt.

[2] This sentence after K., where the episode is also further spun out.

[3] Read: sarvayatnais.

[4] All that is broken, torn, or harmed is in Brahmanic belief uncanny and calamitous. The Jātaka, which often mocks at superstition, has a pretty tale of a man, one of whose garments the mice gnawed, and who then looked on this as an embodied curse and evil boding of dreadful things. His son had to take it with all speed on a stick to the place of dead bodies (No. 87). Cp. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Suttas*, p. 171; J. v. Negelein, *Traumschlüssel des Jagaddeva*, p. 209; MBh., xiii, 104.49, 59, 66; xvi, 2.5; J. J. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, espec. p. 440, addit. to p. 360. Moreover in the German Middle Ages also, it was believed that anyone who had his clothing gnawed by mice would have a mishap. *Ztschr. d. Ver. f. Volksk.*, Bd. 11, p. 278. The fruit that birds have pecked must not be eaten, otherwise atonement must be made by strict mortification. Vasishṭha, xiv, 33; Vishṇu, xxiii, 49; li, 17; Manu, iv, 208; Gautama, xvii, 10. It is otherwise in Vishṇu, xxiii, 49; Vasishṭha, xxviii, 8; Baudhāyana, i, 5, 9.2; according to which the bird that throws down a fruit by pecking at it does not make it unclean.

in his heart, gave it, without compare and bestowing sons, to the prince, and spoke: "Go home again; thy wish is fulfilled." The king gave it to both wives so as not to hurt one of them; they divided the wonderful gift and ate it. But then, alas, each of them bore half a little human being![1] They had these lumps of flesh exposed outside the city by their nurses. But a Rākshasī found the misbirths, put the two halves together, and a strong boy came out of them, which she had handed over to the king.

Also trees in themselves are bestowers of children. To the already-mentioned Brahman Ṛicīka there comes, after his marriage with the king's daughter Satyavatī, his father Bhṛigu, and leaves it to his daughter-in-law to choose a favour.[2] She chooses a son for herself, and one for her mother. He says they shall clasp a tree ṛitau,[3] the daughter an udumbara-tree, the mother an açvattha-tree,[4] and each eat a sacrificial dish (caru) consecrated by a mantra. But the mother gets her daughter to exchange the food in the pot, and the tree, with her, and so things go wrong here, too. For the object of the arrangement was this: the Brahman's wife was to bring forth a

[1] [From Melanesia for conception through eating nuts cp. G. C. Wheeler in *Archiv f. Religionswiss.*, vol. xv, p. 355 (Translator).]

[2] So according to iii, 115.31 ff.

[3] In the favourable time for conception, from the fourth day onwards after the first coming of the monthly purification.

[4] As to the endless theme of the tree and woman's sexual life—on which a note will also be found (No. 212) in my book *Isoldes Gottesurteil*, p. 285—reference will here only be made to Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripiṭaka chinois*, ii, p. 14; Storfer, *Marias jungfräuliche Mutterschaft*, p. 165; Crooke, *Pop. Rel.*, ii, 99, 102, 122; *Cultus Arborum, A Descriptive Account of Phallic Tree Worship*, 1890, pp. 7, 35, 38, 93 f.; Reitzenstein, *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.*, Bd. 41, pp. 648–671; W. Mannhardt, *Baumkultus d. Germanen* (1876), *passim*. And for the clasping of the tree cp. besides Hartland, i, 127 f., Agnipurāṇa, 198.4b ff., where, however, kaṇṭhasūtra probably means "necklace". If mankind comes from trees (see also Albrecht Dietrich, "Mutter Erde," *Archiv f. Religionswiss.*, viii, pp. 16 ff.; Hartland, i, 13 ff.), then it is no wonder that the human race at first lived, too, in trees, as we are told in the good Darwin way in Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa, xlix, 26 ff., 52 ff.

pattern Brahman, and her mother, the king's wife, an outstanding warrior ; and now things would have been just the opposite, but that through the grace of a second miracle the warlike nature of the Brahman's child came to be put off at least to the grandchild, the celebrated Paraçurāma ; while the queen bears the Viçvāmitra who afterwards became a Brahman. This tale is told at greater length in xiii, 4.21 ff. ; and in this account it is Ṛicīka himself who grants the favour, gives the directions, and appears throughout. A third form is found in xii, 48. There only the two sacrificial dishes appear, and not the trees.[1]

The main constituent of the caru is rice. A rice-dish also acts as putrīya (son-granting) in Rām., i, 16 ; only this account has a far more modern and artificial character. King Daçaratha is childless, and makes the horse-sacrifice to overcome this misfortune. When the putrīyā ishṭi is sacrificed, there floats out of the fire in mighty form Vishṇu, who has once already been besought by the gods to become man, and he offers the prince in a mighty dish heavenly milky-rice (pāyasa) prepared by the gods, and says that the queens are to eat this food, and will then bear sons. Thus are born Rāma and his brothers.[2] A magical sacrifice where the queen is to eat of the sacrificial food, to get twins, is also held by King Drupada (MBh., i, 167). Tīrthas, or holy bathing-places that bestow children, are mentioned, for instance in iii, 83.58 ; 84.98 (= 87.9). If anyone in the right condition of soul makes a pilgrimage to the tīrtha Kanyāçrama, and there fasts three days, he wins a divine hundred of daughters, and heaven (iii, 83.190). This second reward will be found a very fitting one.

But it is well-known that pious devices do not always help in this matter ; a good friend must then play his part.[3] And

[1] Cp. Vishṇupur., iv, 7 ; Bhāgavatapur., ix, 15. Here also Ṛicīka is the bestower, and only the caru-dish is used as a means.

[2] Cp. Agnipur., v, 4–5.

[3] In India, at least according to many accounts, the spiritual gentry are ever ready to act as such charitable brethren. Some temples have a great renown, because in them " barren " wives become pregnant ; while the Brahmans in their humble piety leave the honour to the god (Vishṇu). As their wages, however, they demand the handsomest

this helpful neighbour, among the Hindus, has not always found opposition from the husband's side, if he himself was unfitted for the task ; rather the husband has even invited or exhorted him, as the Epic and the other literature tells us. In the Mahābh. the begetter by proxy has a very important place.

We have already heard of the blind-born Dīrghatamas, his unpleasing ways in love, and his repulsion by wife and children. Fastened by the latter onto a raft, he drifted down the Gaṅgā, and in the end came into the kingdom of King Bali. And the virtuous-souled Bali, the truly brave one, took him and chose him out for the business of sons, having learned who he was : " For the carrying on of my line, do thou beget, with my wives, sons skilled in religious and worldly things." Thus addressed, the very mighty Ṛishi answered : " Yes." Then the king sent him his wife Sudeshṇā. But the queen knowing that he was old and blind, did not go, but sent the old man her nurse's daughter. With this Çūdrā he begat eleven sons (i, 104.41 ff.). In the 56th çloka Bhīshma thus ends his account : In this way there were begotten on earth by Brahmans other Kshattriyas also, great in bowmanship, with most excellent knowledge of virtue, brave, and with mighty strength.

Pāṇḍu, himself prevented from the use of his manly powers, bewails in i, 120 his being condemned to unhappiness in this world and the next, because he has no son ; he exhorts his wife Kuntī to see to it that this be made otherwise, and goes on to say : " Therefore do I now send thee, being myself deprived of begetting. Do thou win offspring from one that is equal to me, or better than I. Hearken, O Kuntī, to this tale of Çāradaṇḍāyinī. This heroic wife was charged (niyukta) by her husband to get a son. She now went, having had her period, with pure and holy mind, having bathed (on the fourth day) ; she went in the night to a cross-road, and picked out a Brahman that had come to perfection (dvijaṃ siddham), after she had made sacrifice to the fire god to get a son. And when

women as " wives for the god ". Dubois-Beauchamp, *Hindu Manners*, etc. [3], pp. 593, 601 f. Cp. Thurston, *Omens and Superstitions*, etc., pp. 147 f. Moreover, it is enough in itself for a woman to kiss the member of an ascetic to get a child. Schmidt, *Liebe u. Ehe in Indien*, 481. Cp. further Hartland, i, 62 ff., 69, 76, 116 ff., 121 ff.

this work was done, she lived with him, and there gave life to three sons: Durjaya, and the two others, great chariot-fighters. Do thou, O lovely one, be swiftly stirring about my business (manniyogāt) so that thou raise up offspring for thyself from a Brahman of outstanding asceticism" (i, 120.35 ff.). So, too, in 122.30, 31 he makes the beseeching request that she shall obtain for herself sons of excelling gifts, from a Brahman distinguished for tapas. In like wise the Brahman Vasishṭha calls a son into being for the king Kalmāshapada (who is here, be it said, divyena vidhinā), and at this prince's own request. Here, too, a curse is at work, i, 177.32 ff.; cp. 182.26. The same old holy man does this service in i, 122.21 f.: "By the son of Uddālaka, Çvetaketu Sandāsa, the pious Madayantī (his wife) was charged (niyukta), and went to the Ṛishi Vasishṭha, so we have been told. From him the fair one got a son, Açmaka by name. And this she did to show a favour to her husband."

And indeed the whole caste of warriors now living owes its origin to the Brahmans; for when Paraçurāma had blotted out all Kshattriyas on the earth, "then Brahmans wise in the Veda united with all the Kshattriya women, and begat offspring. 'The son belongs to him that has married the woman,'[1] so it is laid down in the Vedas. Setting their minds steadfastly on righteousness and virtue (dharmaṃ manasi saṃsthāpya), they went to the Brahmans. Among ourselves, too, has been seen the same revival of Kshattriyas brought about" (i, 104.1 ff.). i, 64.4–26 paints in glowing colours what a strong, virtuous, blissful race sprung from this union.

When King Vicitravīrya has died childless, his half-brother Bhīshma, who carries on the government, says: "I will also name the means (hetu) that is necessary for the propagation and increase of the Bharata blood. Hearken thou unto it from my lips: Some Brahman gifted with excellences must be invited for money to raise up children on Vicitravīrya's field for him" (i, 105.1–2).

In these last two cases the husband of the women is at any rate dead; but both of them belong rather to our case than to the real niyoga or levirate; and it is to be particularly noted that in

[1] Pāṇigrahasya tanayaḥ; pater est quem nuptiae demonstrant; l'enfant conçu pendant le mariage a pour père le mari (Code Napoléon).

the place last mentioned the begetter by proxy has to be paid. It is in the light, too, of this that Pāṇḍu's words just given, about him "that is better" than he (i, 120.37), are undoubtedly to be understood; and no less so his utterance: "Men in their misfortune yearn after a son from a more excellent substitute in begetting.[1] (So) men acquire offspring that bestows the fruits of pious order, and is more excellent than even that from their own seed—so has Manu, the son of him that sprang from himself, spoken" (i, 120.35–36). Here uttama devara certainly points also to a Brahman; from him a better progeny naturally springs than from the seed of the nobility. No less are Pāṇḍu's words in i, 120.22–23 probably aimed at the Brahman's acting as the love-proxies for others: "Here on earth, therefore, the best of men (narottamāḥ) are born for the sake of offspring (that is, to get it for others). How can offspring arise on a field, as I arose on my father's field through the great Ṛishi (Vyāsa)?"

It is significant that even the disciple is found as the marriage representative of his teacher, while otherwise one of the most awful sins is in this very thing of the disciple lying (gurutalpin) with his teacher's wife. Thus in xii, 34.22 we read: "For the mounting of the teacher's marriage-bed, when this is done on his behalf, does not smirch the man; Uddālaka had Çvetaketu begotten for him by his disciple."

The gods themselves, who, indeed, in the sagas of the most different peoples take in hand the begetting of famous heroes, step in with their help in the most famous case in the Epic of the love proxyship contrived by the husband: the birth of the

[1] This stock expression āpadi "in the time of misfortune" is thus explained, for instance, by the commentary on Manu, ix, 56: "When there is no male offspring."—"More excellent" than the husband himself. Or: "From one that is most excellent." Less likely: "A son is yearned for from a more excellent man as proxy in begetting." Devara "proxy in begetting" would seem to be made sure by our passage alone, but is also found in the MBh. In Yājñav., i, 68, and Nārada, xii, 80, the word perhaps has this meaning likewise, if we take in the first passage vā—vā = "either—or", which would be quite possible, and in Nārada, xii, 85 tathā as "also, likewise" (Jolly translates by "or"), and not "in this wise".

chief heroes of the Mahābh., the five Pāṇḍavas (i, 120 ff.). King Pāṇḍu has drawn down on himself the curse that he shall at once die, if he do copulate. Therefore from then on he refrains. But he needs sons. Therefore does he urge his wife Kuntī to get from another what he cannot give her.[1] But she makes answer: "Thou must not speak thus to me, who am a virtuous wife, and find my delight by thee, O lotus-eyed one. But thou, O hero, wilt beget with me, in lawful wise, children endowed with heroes' strength. I will go into heaven together with thee. Come thou to me that there may be offspring. I myself, indeed, could draw nigh unto no other man in my thoughts but thee. And what man on earth were more excellent than thou?" Then she relates to him the old legend of the loving wife who even got children from her dead husband; and winds up by saying he shall bestow offspring on her in purely spiritual wise, through the yoga powers he has won by stern asceticism. But now he tells her of the primitive hetæristic conditions that were done away with by Çvetaketu, and of the charge which Çvetaketu himself then laid later on his wife Madayantī; he teaches her that wives are still sexually free except at the time after their period, and, that they must be wholly obedient to their husband, whether he demand right or wrong of them; and he ends by beseeching her not to deprive him of the well-being in the beyond which belongs to those endowed with sons. Then she consents, tells of the magic given her by Durvāsas, and asks which god she shall now call up.[2] He names Dharma, the god of right and

[1] K., i, 135.24 ff. makes the penitents in the forest there say that they it was who had shown Pāṇḍu that he must not yet go of his own will into heaven, but must first win the worlds of bliss through offspring; therefore he must win over Dharma, Vāyu, Indra, and the Açvins to beget him sons. This is, of course, a late interpolation. Cp. B, i, 120.23 ff.

[2] According to K. (i, 129.1 ff.) Kuntī leaves him a second choice open: "Or let me have a Brahman, if thou so please, perfected in all excellences, rejoicing in the weal of all beings. Whatever thou sayest, god or Brahman—as thou biddest, so will I do. From a god the fruit of a son comes forthwith, from a Brahman after a time." This, too, of course is a tendentious insertion.

virtue, for then of a surety, he thinks, no stain will lie on the matter, and a pious son will be his. She offered up the bali gift, and murmured her cabbalistic prayer. Then came the god in a heavenly chariot shining as the sun, and laughingly spoke : " Kuntī, what shall I give thee ? " She answered, though he laughed at her : " Give me a son." He united with her in a shape formed by his magic powers, and so she received that Yudhishṭhira, the friend to all beings. When he had been born, Pāṇḍu spoke : " It is said that what is greatest in the Kshattriya is strength, therefore do thou choose for thyself a son marked out by his strength." So she called the god of the wind. And to his question she answered with a shame-faced laugh : " Grant me a son, a strong, a great one, a shatterer of the pride of all ! " So came the warrior-giant, the man of might, Bhīma or Bhīmasena to life, who directly after birth fell from his mother's lap onto a rock, and crushed it with his limbs. Indra was to beget her the third son, that he might become an all-powerful hero and overcomer of foes, like the king of the gods himself ; and so her husband taught her a strict way of mortification, which she had to carry out for a whole year, and he, too, gave himself up, for the same end, to most fervent devotion and asceticism, standing on one leg. And this yielded fruit. Indra appeared to Pāṇḍu and promised to fulfil his wish ; Kuntī now brought up the prince of heaven by magic, and he begat Arjuna with her. The happy father, for whom others, immortals too, themselves so willingly brought the finest boys into the world, was now really caught up in a wave of enthusiasm and in a stronger yearning after sons ; so he wanted still more of Kuntī. But she repulsed him angrily : " More than three sons are not granted even in misfortune. If there were another the wife would become one that is unbridled (svairiṇī), and with a fifth she would be a worthless woman (bandhakī). How canst thou, a wise man, who hast learned this law, now go beyond it and ask me for offspring ? " Then came Pāṇḍu's second wife, Mādrī, and said to him : " I am not sorrowed that thou art not a proper man, nor that I am ever set behind her that is worthy of thy favour (Kuntī). But this is my great sorrow, that I, though we are equal (both thy wives) have no son." As she herself

cannot ask her rival, through her angry pride towards her, Pāṇḍu, she says, must beg her to get offspring for her (Mādrī), too. He then exhorted Kuntī to do this, and she said to her fellow-wife [1]: "Think only once of the divinity. He will grant thee the gift of fitting offspring." Mādrī called up the two Açvins, and so got the twins Nakula and Sahadeva. Of the father thus blessed the pious and noble Vidura (i, 127.4) then said that he was not to be pitied, but to be praised.

The niyoga in the narrower meaning, the levirate, on the other hand is represented by the well-known begetting of Pāṇḍu himself, and of Dhṛitarāshṭra (i, 103 ff.). After King Vicitravīrya has died childless, his mother Satyavatī comes to her husband's son, to Bhīshma, and says that, as the only shield of his family and its earthly and heavenly welfare, and as one that knows and carefully follows the law and the truth, he must in agreement with these both, and at their behest (niyoga) beget offspring for his dead brother with the two young and beautiful wives of the dead man. Bhīshma now sees that this is dharma, but he reminds her that for her sake, so that his father might marry her, he has sworn never to touch a woman; and the sun can lose its light, and the host of the elements their properties, but he cannot be faithless to the truth and his word. He tells her now how the whole Kshattriya caste was after its utter destruction called back again to life through the union of the Kshattriya women with the Brahmans, how Bṛihaspati, Utathya's brother, lay with his sister-in-law, and how the fruit of her body, Dīrghatamas, born blind through the holy man's curse, had been appointed royal purveyor of children to the court in the house of Bali; and he puts it to her that in this case, too, a Brahman should be hired. But she then tells him, in laughing confusion and halting words, of her youthful adventure with the penitent Parāçara, and the result of this affair, the famous Vyāsa. So soon as she thinks of him, he will come, she says. He it is that, appointed by her (niyukta), shall see to the matter. Bhīshma is satisfied with this; she tells the Yogi, who at once appears, as follows: "To the father

[1] Read uktā (çl. 15). Instead of "once only" perhaps better: once for all, constantly, fixedly (sakṛit)? But Kuntī only grants her rival one son, at least at first. So that "once" might be very deliberate.

and the mother children are born as common property. Just as the father is lord over them, so is the mother. As thou by the hand of fate art my first son,[1] so Vicitravīrya was my child born after thee. As Bhīshma on the father's side, thou art Vicitravīrya's brother on the mother's side." Bhīshma, she says, cannot undertake the business after his oath, so Vyāsa, out of regard for his brother, and to carry on the line shall raise up children by the young and lovely wives at Bhīshma's spoken word, and at her bidding ; and he has the power to do it. The penitent consents, but makes it a condition that the two widows must first for a year keep a vow of mortification to be drawn up by him,[2] so as to be cleansed, for otherwise a woman may not draw nigh to him ; also they must take his personal qualities as part of the bargain. Splendidly decked, and having bathed on the fourth day after the monthly cleansing, the eldest first awaits the appointed—but to her wrapped in mystery—father of her future child. Now the smell of holiness is not to everyone's liking, particularly in Old India, where penitents look on dirt and piety as inseparable ; moreover Vyāsa after the Ṛishi kind has red hair, and with it flaming eyes and a red-brown moustache, and other ugly qualities. So she shuts her eyes at the sight of him. As a result her son shall, according to the inspired man's words, be born blind. The mother Satyavatī wails : " A blind man cannot rule ; beget another." He agrees. But the second wife becomes quite wan (pāṇḍu) when the visitor appears by night. So she bears a pale son, Pāṇḍu. Satyavatī now wants a third grandson, and therefore once more charges Vyāsa and the eldest daughter-in-law. The latter, however, thinks of the evil smell and the ugliness of the Ṛishi, and sends in her own stead a splendidly adorned slave-girl. With this latter the ascetic then helps to bring Vidura into being. Cp. v, 147.17–47.

The bringing in of this son of an unmarried girl, who never lived in the family of his mother's husband, does not seem after all to have been in such a very near correspondence with

[1] Read sa tvaṃ instead of satyam.

[2] It is the vow to keep always quite faithful to the truth—a spitefulness which is not only very ungallant, but is only at all possible for a woman-hater.

the laws of the levirate, although as a Brahman he must have been moreover especially well fitted for his part. For King Çiçupāla makes the reproach to Bhīshma: "Why didst thou, an it please thee, steal the maiden named Ambā, that loved another, and knew the law? In that thy brother Vicitravīrya would not have this maiden that had been robbed by thee, he walked the way of the good. And with his two wives children have been begotten by another, through a proceeding which good men do not follow, and thou, smug in thy wisdom, dost calmly look on." He then goes on to suggest that this love service should have fallen to Bhīshma's lot. These words, it is true, are found in the bitter speech, so heartening and refreshing in itself, against the worthless and profligate upstart Kṛishṇa, and Bhīshma, who has sung such burning praises of Kṛishṇa, has to come in for his share here. There may be, however, a finger-post to be read by us here (ii, 41.24 ff.).[1] Moreover

1 The tale in its form to-day has been naturally much changed. At first Bhīshma evidently really did fulfil his brotherly duty, and became the father of Pāṇḍu and Dhṛitarāshṭra. See xi, 23.24. That has already been shown by Ludwig, and Holtzmann after him (*Das Mahābh. u. seine Teile*, i, 154 ff.; ii, 172; iv, 193). Then Vyāsa was brought in, perhaps not only through Brahmanic pride, but because, too, the tale of Bhīshma's vow of chastity now stood in the way; for the reverse relation of the ages for the two tales is less likely. But it is only to his Brahmanhood that Vyāsa owed this honour, not to his threadbare-thin authorization as a kinsman. This can clearly be seen from Pāṇḍu's own words in i, 120.22, 23, and just as clearly from his speech to Kuntī, if we compare 122.23, 24 with 122.21, 22 and 121.35–41. So, too, our tale itself shows that it is as a Brahman that Vyāsa is to come in. According to i, 2.101 it was also a varadāna. But in the end offence was perhaps taken to this "singing the praises" of the "gods of the earth", and "gods of the gods", remarkable as that might seem, if the alteration here sprang from a Brahmanic source. Arjuna, nearly always so correct from the priestly standpoint, indeed calls out very angrily: "What grounds had King Kalmāshapāda, then, in his thoughts for assigning (saṃniyojita) his wife to his teacher, the best of the Brahma-knowers? Why did the high-minded Vasishṭha, who yet knows the highest holy law, the great Ṛishi, thus lie with her that for him was not for lying with? It is unlawful what Vasishṭha did in former days" (i, 182.1 ff.). Then recourse was had to the levirate

the levirate is at least well enough known to the heroes of the Mahābh. for them to use it in comparisons. So in xiii, 8.22 : " As the woman when her husband dies makes the brother-in-law [1] her husband, so the earth makes the Kshattriya her

of the Smṛiti, and now a " brother-in-law ", of course, had to be brought in (Gautama, xxviii, 23 ; cp. Manu, ix, 144).

[1] Or : a proxy in begetting (devara) ? From the kurute patim it is hardly to be concluded that a real marriage is referred to. I myself can just as little get this for Bhīshma out of dārāṃç ca kuru dharmeṇa (i, 103.11). True, it seems as though xiii, 44.52–53 at least in the first place allots the widow, too, to the brother-in-law (the brothers-in-law ?) as the regular wife. Note too, the angry words of Sītā later on aimed at Lakshmaṇa. According to Yule's *Marco Polo*, ii, 376, all Indians even have had the custom of marrying the brother's widow ! In many parts of India it is moreover still a very usual custom to-day for the younger brother to take the widow of his brother to wife. Crooke, *The North-Western Provinces*, p. 229. Bṛihaspati refers to it as a usage of the people of Khaça that the brother marries his brother's widow (ii, 31), and in this passage he finds this quite in order there ; on the other hand in xxvii, 20 he calls it a very reprehensible practice of " other lands " that the brother lives with the brother's widow. It is open to question whether he is here speaking of the Indian area ; and the Khaças were held at least for degenerated, which, it is true, means little for us. As is well known, the law writings only deal with the narrower niyoga, that is to say, the brother or some other near kinsman, usually sapiṇḍa or sagotra (in Gautama, xvii, 5, even piṇḍagotraṛishisambandhās or yonimātra) of the dead man and the widow are solemnly entrusted with the begetting of offspring for the dead man, one or even two sons, but not more ; and two are allowed only by Manu and Gautama. Apart from the relations needful for this the two must be to one another as father-in-law and daughter-in-law. Even during the embrace all passion must be most strictly kept away. This is very strongly stressed by several law-givers. According to Vasishṭha the widow must first lead a life of mortification for half a year, then come in her ṛitu to him appointed for begetting (this last detail is also given by others) ; but according to Baudhāyana a whole year (but he mentions the half, too, as Maudgalya's opinion). Such a son is then called kshetraja ; and for the most part the word is used only in this narrower meaning. On the other hand the expression is in Parāçara, iv, 22, probably like datta and kṛitrima a collective concept, and then denotes any fruit that has grown up on the husband's " field ", that is, also the kānīna,

husband, when she does not get the Brahman." Cp. xii, 72.12.

Our attention is aroused by the fact that it is almost only the Brahmans in these tales that are used as stud-bulls, and then as those of the warriors. It is just this that casts suspicion on the matter so soon as we ask how much ground, indeed, there may have been for such statements in reality, even if it is only in more ancient times. This, indeed, is true : in later times in India, too, as so often in many other places, the priest is found as the lawful third in the alliance, and Old Indian literature often bears witness to the belief that especially the son begotten by an ascetic grows to excel others in capacity ; thus it is that in the pious legends also of the non-Brahmanic sects the monks and holy men often get into straits through

sahoḍha, gūḍhaja (and paunarbhava). Manu first allows and describes the niyoga, and then absolutely forbids it. Bṛihaspati finds the explanation in its not being fitting in this present evil age. Cp. Bühler's Manu, p. xciv, and Bṛihaspati, xxiv, 14. On the levirate son begotten in the prescribed way there rests no stain, but such a stain there is if the matter has not been rightly carried out. Gautama in xxviii, 23 declares that where the widow has still a brother-in-law, her son called into life by another man cannot inherit. Nārada, xii, 48, indeed, applies to the woman who is given by her kinsfolk to a sapiṇḍa, there being no brother-in-law, the abusive term " married again ". The main passages dealing with the niyoga, especially of the widow, are : Manu, ix, 58 ff. ; 143 ff. ; Baudh., ii, 2, 4.7 ff. (= ii, 2.60 ff.) ; Gautama, xviii, 4 ff. ; Yājñav., i, 68 f. ; Bṛihaspati, xxiv, 12 ; Vas., xvii, 55 ff. ; Nārada, xii, 80 ff. (cp. 48, 50). The two last-named law teachers, especially Nārada, are very detailed and characteristic. Yājñav., i, 68 f., probably has reference to the niyoga of the widow as the commentators understand it. If we take the words, it is true that the husband might be still alive, and even be what is meant by guru. Moreover, the same law teacher says that the kshetraja has been begotten with a sagotra (a kinsman bearing the same family-name) or " another man " (ii, 128). The addition of " man " would probably be more natural than the " kinsman " of the commentators. On the other hand Yājñav. condemns him that goes to the brother's wife without an injunction as strongly as the other law-givers. Cp. especially Kauṭilya (transl.), Index under " Vikariatszeugung ". [From Melanesia for indirect reference to the Levirate idea cp. G. C. Wheeler, *Mono-Alu Folklore*, p. 41 (Translator).]

women wishful to be made fruitful.[1] Then the begetting by proxy with the husband's authorization is to be found for Old India in general in the other narrative literature also,[2] it has

[1] See e.g. Āyāraṅgasutta, ii, 1, § 12.

[2] I have referred in my Daçakum., p. 54, to a very drastic case from the Jātaka. According to Manu, ix, 59 the "commissioning" can or must take place wherever there is no offspring, that is, probably, even if the husband is still alive. But only the kinsman is there named as one qualified. The rest of the law and Purāṇa literature also contains highly instructive statements on begetting by proxy in the husband's life-time. According to Āpast., ii, 10, 27.2 ff., the custom of giving up the wife to a man of the clan (gentilis) to get a son, not to speak of another man, is forbidden in this age of Kali; a union with the clan-fellow is now looked on as adultery, both husband and wife alike then go to hell; there is a better reward given in the world beyond for keeping the law than for offspring so begotten. This passage is enough to show that in such cases of need, at least at first and in many places, the help of a clansman or member of the family was asked, as is indeed quite natural. "For they say that the bride is given to the family," that is, the whole family has a right to hope that from her an upholder of the line will come; and if the husband is unsuccessful then he calls for the help of those so nearly concerned. But why should the express charge be needful at all, if the wife anyhow were at the disposal of all the members of the family? There is therefore here no trace of such a handing over of the bride to the whole family or, indeed, to the gens; just as there is nothing of the kind to be deduced for India from Bṛihaspati's statement that in "other lands" there is found the highly reprehensible custom of marrying the girl to the whole family. Indeed, Bṛishaspati himself directly afterwards names the Persians as evil sinners, who unite even with their mother (xxviii, 20–21). Gautama, xviii, 11 ff., gives rules as to whom the child belongs to, if the husband himself has given his wife over to another man to raise up children. So Baudhāyana, ii, 2, 3.17 ff. speaks of the son of a man who cannot beget or of an incurably sick man, that had been ordered from another. Yājñavalkya, ii, 127 says: "If a sonless man through niyoga (commissioning) begets a son on another's field, this son is the heir and giver of the forefathers' cake to both men." Parāçara, xii, 58 ff. lays it down that: "If by leave of the owner of the field (the husband) seed is sown in his field, then the offspring is looked on as the property of both, the seed-giver and the owner of the field. . . . But the offspring does not belong to the man that unites in another man's house with a woman; this is looked on by the learned as adultery

always been in existence in various lands, and, be it noted, in princely families, and even to-day it has not yet died out.[1] But the Mahābh. in its present shape is so deeply concerned with the craziest glorification of the Brahman, that we shall hardly go wrong, if in the legends in the Epic of this priestly activity as proxies we see little else but partisan suggestion.[2] Furthermore, by the Brahmanic mind, as it is reflected in Smṛiti and other later literature, begetting by proxy, whether in the life-time or after the death of the husband, was looked on generally as wrongful. The teaching there is ever: Quod licet jovi non licet bovi; what the gods and the holy men of the pure early times have done is right for them, but for us ordinary mortals of another age, namely, the evil age of Kali, it is forbidden; indeed, as has been already mentioned, neither in the Mahābh. nor elsewhere is blame wanting for those only so-called models of virtue.

except when the wife herself has come into the house (of the strange man)." From this it will be seen that: if the child is to be looked on as the husband's child, then it must be begotten in the husband's house; but if the outsider begets it in his own house, then he has his own, natural, absolute, right to the fruit of the union—a view very easily understood. Cf. Kauṭilya (transl.), 260.1–18, and especially the addition to it.

[1] See, for instance, Kauṭilya (transl.), 43.4 ff.; Brantôme, *Œuvr. compl.* ed. du Panthéon lit., ii, 243b. In his view the wives, however, must not reckon on such politeness in their husbands as is shown by many, who themselves invite gallants to their wives, and charge the lovers to treat the beloved one well (p. 250 f.), but those fair ones who are burdened with an ugly, stupid, pitiful husband must have children made for themselves by dapper, proper *serviteurs—pour l'amour de leur lignée* (262 ff.). Cp., too, Henne am Rhyn, *Die Frau in der Kulturgesch.*, p. 113 (among the Spartiatae the lover could even demand of the husband to share in the wife).

[2] In German: Tendenzfiktion (tendentious fiction). Further, Vishṇu, xv, 3 also says that the kshetraja is begotten by a sapiṇḍa or a Brahman (uttamavarṇa) (it is not said whether the husband is still alive). That a ripe (but not yet married) maiden should without hesitation let children be begotten to her by an excelling Brahman (or: by a Brahman as being the most excellent of men) Devayānī finds quite in order (i, 83.1–8). She is a Brahman woman, and the girl in question a Kshattriyā. Cp. Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, iii, 3.

In itself, it is true, such a service of love found no hindrance from the law, even when the husband was alive, if the husband authorized or invited his wife. The view that is always stressed in Indian literature is this : The wife is the husband's field (kshetra) ; that which grows on his field belongs to him, no matter who has sown it (cp. for instance Manu, ix, 32–55). And the owner can himself till his ground, or have it tilled by another ; the fruit is always his.[1]

[1] Perhaps few so true and fruitful sentences—always presuming that our modern scientific method is justified—are to be found in the literature of the subject as this one in Starcke, *Primitive Family* (1889), p. 241 : "We must therefore regard marriage as a legal institution, and the sexual intercourse between husband and wife as only one of the matters with which this institution has to do ; it is by no means its central point and *raison d'être*." Cp. p. 255 f., where, however, the view that the man is afraid of losing his wife, if she have intercourse with another man without his consent, is a very extraordinary one. The words on p. 260 there are just as excellently said : "Marriage is sharply distinguished from the mere relations of passion . . . His (the husband's) ownership (of the children) does not depend on the fact they were begotten by him, but upon the fact that he owns and supports their mother" (cp. p. 106). As a matter of fact "supports" should here be deleted ; for among savages it is so often far rather the duty of the wife to support the man ; indeed, the main reason for his marrying is this, that he wants a beast of burden. Jealousy in our meaning primitive man does not know, or only very seldom indeed, or, anyhow, not where his mate is concerned. It is only the unauthorized use of his property that angers him. Not any Tom, Dick, and Harry may use his tools without more ado, ride his horse, and so on. But to the owner belongs whatever his field—the wife—brings forth, as, for instance, the Australians, celebrated though they are as a mother-right people, also hold (Finck, 175, after Cunow, *Die Verwandtschaftsverhältn. d. Australneger* ; cp. Henne am Rhyn, pp. 16–17 ; Starcke, 284 (Amerinds) ; Osman Bey, *Die Frau in der Türkei*, p. 7 (Mohammed)).

It is true we have reports from by no means few mother-right peoples and tribes that among them the husband has nothing whatever to say about the children. But such exceptions, even if they be very many, cannot upset the general rule. A matriarchate because of the fatherhood being uncertain is an utterly ungrounded hypothesis (except perhaps for certain very clearly determined cases). How

little heed was given even by our forefathers, who ſtood so high in sexual matters, the Old Germans, to the queſtion whether they were actually the father to their children, is shown in detail by Dargun, *Mutterrecht u. Raubehe*, in the third chapter; and on p. 45 he gives a valuable passage (which, indeed, sounds rather like a witticism) from the Weſtphalian peasant laws, according to which the man who was not able to satisfy his amorous wedded wife had to take her himself to another one. Cf. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, ed. by Heusler and Hübner, 1899, vol. i, p. 613 ff. "Of the Arabs we are told there is a form of marriage according to which a man says to his wife when menſtruation is over, Send a message to such an one, and beg him to have intercourse with you.' And he himself refrains from intercourse with her until it is manifeſt that she is with child by the man in queſtion. The husband acts this way in order that his offspring may be noble." Starcke, *Prim. Fam.*, pp. 123–124. Also the Chukchi in Siberia get their wives to be made pregnant by others; and it is reported of certain Koryaks that they were wont to get the Russian poſtman as a ſtud-bull (Hartland, ii, 181). Childless Bantu bring their brother to their wife; and among the Wakamba in Africa rich men who have no offspring give one of their wives to a friend, that there may be offspring (Hartland, ii, 214, 196). The beſt-known case is Sparta, where a law ordered the elderly owner of a young wife to mate a young and luſty likely father with her (Hartland, i, 322; ii, 134). On this and on begetting by proxy among the Greeks in general, and among others of the older peoples, cp. Engels, *Ursprung d. Familie*, 49; Henne am Rhyn, *Die Frau in der Kulturgesch.*, 193 ff.; Starcke, loc. cit., 124; O. Schrader, *Die Indogermanen*, p. 93; Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altertums*, i, 1^3, pp. 28–30, and what is there said. It is on very good grounds that Hartland can say that the examples are "innumerable" where the husband, to get children, brings in another man in his ſtead (ii, 247).—Now proper men above all others are the prieſt, the chief, the ruler. Above and beyond this, as already said, he confers an honour on the commonalty thereby. So among the Eskimos a man and his wife look on themselves as lucky when a shaman takes pity in this way on the family. They believe that the son of a holy man with such power over the spirits will outſtrip other mortals in excellence and good fortune. The Greenlanders even paid the Angekoks for such services (Starcke, 123; Weſtermarck ^{3}, 80; Hartland, ii, 141; Elsie Clews Parsons, *The Old-Fashioned Woman*, p. 87; Müller-Lyer, *Phasen der Liebe*, p. 22 f.). And from the woman, who is almoſt everywhere in the world unclean and a bringer of deſtruction, and her husband, set into danger by her, spirits and evil

It is to this view that a good proportion of the twelve kinds of sons enumerated in the law books owes its being. They are also named in the Mahābh., i, 120.32–34, and the account given here, too, has a singularly mild tone towards the "pretty sins" of the woman, and differs considerably from the account in the law writings. As bandhudāyada, that is, as sons who are kinsmen (belong to the family) and are entitled to inherit, are named: 1śt, svayaṃjāta (one begotten by the husband himself, aurasa); 2nd, praṇīta (brought by the wife to the husband, and, as the commentary declares in agreement with çl. 35–36, begotten by the free grace of a better man); 3rd, parikrīta (bought, according to Nīl. begotten with the wife by another, who has been paid for the seed; which in view of 1, 105.2 is certainly right); 4th, paunarbhava (the son of a re-married woman)[1]; 5th, kānīna (unmarried woman's child); 6th,

influences are warded off by the priest as a partner in the bed or fellow in wedlock. In this, therefore, the Brahmans do but stand in a row with others of their stamp. Holtzmann quotes (*Mahābh. u. seine Teile*, i, 155) the testimony of Graul that even "to-day" the women in Malayala, all and each, are accessible to the pleasure of the unmarried Brahmans, and that this does not in any way degrade them, but rather it is looked on as an honour. In Dubois-Beauchamp [3], p. 117, we can read that when the Gurus or spiritual fathers of the Çivaites come to a place, the people vie with one another to see who shall lodge them. Those who are thus sought after decide on a house—and as a matter of fact it is said of them that in this they make their choice according to the youthfulness and good looks of the women living there—then all the men leave the field open and keep away so long as their reverences are pleased to tarry amid this delightful band. So, too, the leaders of the Vishṇuite Vallabhācāryas claim absolute power over the female part of their flock (Crooke, *The North-Western Provinces of India*, p. 250). On niyoga and the begetting of Dhṛitarāshṭra and Pāṇḍu, see further Winternitz, JRAS, 1897, p. 716 ff.

[1] Paunarbhava is the son of a punarbhū (re-married woman). According to Baudh., ii, 2, 3.27 punarbhū is a woman that has left an impotent husband and taken another; according to Vasishṭha, xvii, 19 f. she is one whose former husband is impotent, expelled from his caste, mad, or dead, and who has married another man, or else one that has left the husband of her youth, linked herself with another, and then has come back again into her husband's house. According to

svairiṇyāṃ yaç ca jāyate (conceived by the woman in adultery, that is = kuṇḍa, gūḍhotpanna, gūḍhaja). The six sons that can inherit but do not belong to the family are called ; 1śt, datta ("given away by father and mother," as Nīl. says, but here also probably as a small child, that is, *adoptatio*) ; 2nd, krīta (bought from the parents) ; 3rd, kṛitrima, "and (therefore) he that himself goes thither," that is, the svayaṃdatta, while kṛitrima or kṛita is otherwise the son that is taken over as a grown up ; 4th, sahoḍha (with whom the mother was at the wedding already pregnant by another man) ; 5th, jñātiretas ("seed of kinsman," that is, begotten in the levirate) ; 6th, hīnayonidhṛita (begotten of a woman from a low caśte, that is, especially the "Çūdra son".[1]

A liśt that partly differs is given in xiii, 49. Yudhishṭhira says : "We hear of many disputes that arise out of the queśtion of the sons. Do thou solve the doubt for us, who are bewildered." Bhīshma now firśt of all sets forth nine kinds of sons : 1śt, ātman (the one begotten by himself, and therefore the son belonging to the begetter himself) ; 2nd, anantaraja (begotten by the next of kin to the husband, that is, in the

Vishṇu, xv, 7 ff. she is one that has been married for the second time as a virgin, or that has lived with another man before her marriage at law ; according to Manu, ix, 175 she is one whose husband has left her, or is dead, and who has married again. Yājñavalkya, i, 67 says : one that is, or is not harmed in her maidenhead, and that lets herself be "dedicated" for the second time (cp. Manu, ix, 176). According to Nārada, xii, 45 ff., there are three kinds of punarbhū, of which each is worse than the one following : (1) the girl that has not, indeed, lośt her maidenhead, but has lośt her honour through an earlier taking by the hand ; (2) a woman that has run off from the husband of her youth, and gone to another, but has afterwards come back to the firśt husband ; (3) a woman that is given to a sapiṇḍa of the same caśte, because there are no brothers-in-law. Elsewhere there are also other interpretations of the term.

[1] Practically this is the mośt natural interpretation. It also agrees with the comment. Philologically more exact would be : 3rd, kṛitrima (the son taken over as a grown up) ; 4th, he that comes of his own accord ; 5th, he with whom a kinsman had already impregnated the mother before the wedding.

levirate) [1] ; 3rd, niruktaja (begotten by one expressly named, that is, by one that has been asked to fertilize, and that probably by the husband) ; 4th, prasṛitaja (" begotten by one that has come ", that is, according to Nīl., by another man from sexual appetite, who has not been asked to do it, that is, the gūḍhaja) ; 5th, the son, begotten with the man's own wife, of one that has been expelled from his caste (?) [2] ; 6th, datta ; 7th, kṛita ; 8th, adhyūḍha (added by marriage = sahoḍha or acquired by marriage) ; 9th, kānīna. After this come the twelve other kinds of sons which are found as the result of a quite different principle, namely : the six apadhvaṃsaja (three sons of the Brahman with Kshattriyā, Vaiçyā, and Çūdrā ; two sons of the Kshattriya with Vaiçyā and Çūdrā ; one son of the Vaiçya with Çūdrā), and the six apasada (three sons of Çūdra with a Brahman woman, Kshattriyā, Vaiçyā, that is, the cāṇḍāla, vrātya, vaidya ; two sons of the Vaiçya from a Brahman woman and a Kshattriyā, that is, the māgadha and the vāmaka ; and one son of the Kshattriya from a Brahman woman, namely the sūta). Then Yudhishṭhira asks : " Some say that a son is the product of the field, others that he is the product of the seed. The same is true of both : that they are sons. But whose ? Tell me that." Bhīshma spoke : " He that is begotten of the (husband's own) seed is his son, and he that has

[1] According to Nīl. " directly begotten," for he paraphrases by aurasa " bodily ", that is, takes ātmā in another meaning. We should then have only eight kinds.

[2] Patitasya tu bhāryāyā bhartrā susamavetayā. In this barbaric construction we must probably first change bhāryāyā to bhāryayā. But the wife of a patita is not bhartrā susamavetā. I would therefore put bhāryayābhartrā : " The son of a man expelled from his caste (being) by his wife, who had equipped herself probably with another man not her husband." But since bhartar here, like pati and dārās in the above-quoted verses, perhaps simply means a proxy-husband, one would get with bhartrā, too, essentially the same meaning : " who had probably provided herself with a (proxy-)husband." The patita is an outlaw, a dead man ; and just as the younger brother of such a one may marry before him without fear, so the wife of the expelled man may unite sexually with another man, and the child is then looked on as her actual husband's (probably if he is then rehabilitated ; cp. K, xiii, 84.6).

grown up on his field, if he has been given up (by his real begetter), he that is 'added by marriage', if the contract is broken (samayaṃ bhittvā)." He then explains this thus: "If a man begets a son from himself, and then on some ground gives him up, then the seed has nothing to say here, but he belongs to the lord of the field. If a man weds a maiden in his yearning for a son, for the sake of a son, then it is the growing up from his own field that decides, and he is not the son of his begetter. Moreover the son that has grown up on the field (anyatra lakshyate) betrays himself, for the self (of the begetter) (which shows itself again in the child) cannot be destroyed; we come to it (come on its tracks) through the pattern (that is, we look at the father, and know by the likeness that he has again produced his self in a certain child)." [1] According to this it would therefore seem that the husband need only to recognize this child of his wife, already pregnant at marriage, if he knew of her being pregnant, and approved of it, or, indeed, actually chose the girl for that reason.[2] Anyatra generally

[1] Of this the Liburni were evidently fully convinced. They had a community of wives, and the children were brought up in common until they were five years old. Then they were called together by beating the drum, examined, and assigned to their fathers according to likeness (Starcke, p. 126, after Bachofen, *Mutterrecht*, p. 20). The same is reported from other ancient peoples. Hartland, ii, 131; Ed. Meyer, 24; Welhausen, *Gött. Nachr.* (1893), 462 f. And that woman, of whom we are told in Kirchhof's *Wendunmut* (ed. Oesterley, Stuttg. Lit. Ver.), i, p. 397 (No. 338), seems to have firmly believed this. She had much to do with the clergy, and once when she was lying in child-bed, a woman caller exclaimed: "The son looks exactly like his father." The pious dove started up in fright: "Oh! has he got a bald patch, too?" On how strong the Indian belief is in the inheritance of character see J. J. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, 263–265.

[2] "So among the hill tribes of Northern Aracan sexual intercourse before marriage is unrestricted, 'and it is considered rather a good thing,' we are told, 'to marry a girl in the family-way, even though by another man.'" Hartland, i, 312. So also among the Wakamba (Hartland, ii, 196). Thus it is natural that it is the very girl who has already given birth who among several peoples is more sought after in the marriage market than her sister, who has not been blessed with

means " in the other case " (and Böhtl. does not once give " moreover "). Taking all into account we must so translate here too ; and the çloka that begins with it would then all the more clearly leave the husband the right to assign to the begetter as revealed by nature the fruit of his wife's body, of which he had no knowledge at the wedding, and which he does not want. The kṛitaka or kṛitrima is then thus drastically defined : He that is put out on the street by his parents, and then is taken to himself by a man (yas taṃ prakalpayet), and whose parents are not known, this is the kṛitrima.[1] His sonship is derived only from the taking over (saṃgraha) by the adoptive parents, not from the " seed " nor from the " field ". This man who was once masterless belongs to his present master, comes into the caste of him that rears him, must be equipped by him like his own son with the sacraments of his caste and kindred, and may be chosen for kinship by marriage.[2] Further on we find it said : " The son of an unmarried woman, and he that is added by marriage are to be looked on as sprung from sin (kilbisha), but the sacraments are to be carried out on them also, as on the sons of the body."

A third passage where a list of the various sons is found is i, 74.99. Here according to the commentary—and the learned men of Europe follow it—five classes are named. But, so far as I can see, this view is hardly a possible one. The most obvious translation would be : " Manu has made known the five sons born from a man's own wife, (then) the acquired, the bought, the reared, the ' made ' (kṛita) sons, that is, the (four) that have come into being in other women." The labdha could then include in himself the datta and the svayaṃdatta of Manu, whereby naturally I do not mean to say that we are to give weight to the constant appeal to the famous law-giver. The " reared " one might then perhaps be the apaviddha. Also the five by the man's own wife offer a difficulty. But as

a proof of her fruitfulness, and that in many places, and in German-speaking districts, too, the young man will hardly take a girl to his home who has not first become with child by him.

[1] The man here described is, as is well known, in the law books called apaviddha.

[2] Cp. in the MBh., the example of Karṇa.

the son of the " re-married woman " in the second list of the Mahābh. has been eliminated, so here he may also have dropped out, and thus we should have the other five, as taught by Manu. Yet this rendering, which in itself is the most natural one, is not without an element of strain ; therefore the çloka is perhaps better understood thus : " Those that came into being from a man's own wife (and) the five (kinds of) sons that have been acquired (that is, given), bought, reared, ' made,' and born of other women." That would then give twelve kinds, if Manu and Mahābh., xiv, 49 are brought in to explain, but fourteen if MBh., i, 120.32–34 is so brought in. K. has instead (i, 99.25–26) : " Those sprung from a man's own wife, those acquired, made, brought up under an agreement (samayavardhita), bought, and sprung from maidens—these Manu has declared to be sons. These are the six who are kinsmen and heirs (and) the six who are kinsmen, but not heirs." [1]

[1] There is not complete agreement in the various law writings either as to the order of rank of the twelve kinds of sons, or as to the two divisions : (1) sons who belong to the family and have also the right to inherit ; (2) sons who only belong to the family, but have not the right to inherit. The category, " capable of inheriting, but not belonging to the family," moreover, is found only in the MBh. Here we give only one or two details which are perhaps of special importance for the subject of this book. All the law books put the kshetraja (the son begotten by a proxy) next after the son of the body ; only Yājñavalkya names before him and as fully equal to the aurasa the son of the inheriting daughter (putrikā). While the son of the inheriting daughter according to the general view is the heir of his sonless grandfather, and also of his father, if this latter has no other son, but in return also takes over in both families the duty of the sacrificing to the forefathers, Gautama, xxviii, 32 throws him into the last place but two in the second group. The gūḍhotpanna or he that is begotten in adultery is reckoned by all to group I, the sahoḍha (he that marriage brought in the bride's body) only in Nārada (xiii, 45), while otherwise he generally takes the second place in category II, in Vasishṭha, xvii, 26 and Vishṇu, xv, 15 the first place, in Yājñav., ii, 131 the last place but one. The kānīna or unmarried woman's son is among the first and privileged set of six in all except Manu, ix, 161, as also Gautama, xxviii, 33 and Baudhāyana, ii, 2, 3.32 ; but these two agree here exactly with Manu, only that Baudh. brackets the

putrikāputtra with the datta of Manu, and so gets thirteen classes, and Gautama handles the son of the heiress-daughter like a very cruel father in the way already mentioned. In these three the kānīna is found at the head of group II. The paunarbhava is taken by Vasishṭha, xvii, 13 ff., Yājñav., ii, 128 ff., Vishṇu, xv, 1 ff., into I, while in Nārada he stands in the first place in II, in Manu and his followers in the last place but two. Yājñavalkya and Vishṇu, it is true, do not expressly mention the two categories. All lay it down that if there are no sons really entitled to inherit, then the others must come into the inheritance according to their rank. The greater number, that is, Vas., Nār., Yājñ., and Vishṇu in their six first classes have only actual children of the mother, no matter who the father may be. Vas., xvii, 22, 23, and Yājñ., ii, 129 (= Agnipur., 256.16) assert that the unmarried woman's son belongs to the girl's father, which sounds the more remarkable in that these two law teachers reckon the kānīna among the very members of the husband's family who are entitled to inherit. Whether this prescription is only to hold when the mother does not marry is very much open to question. The meaning is rather as follows: If the father has no sons, then that son of his daughter, whom she has borne in his own house, is his natural heir. Cp. Nārada, xii, 60; Meyer, Kauṭilya, p. 765 at foot. The usual doctrine is that the kānīna like the sahoḍha belongs to him that takes the mother to his house. So, for instance, Manu, ix, 172 f.; Vishṇu, xv, 12, 17. In fact the great question in dispute is found running, too, through the law books: What is it that decides, field or seed? Manu, ix, 31 ff. and x, 70, declares that "the seed is more important", and proves it without hesitation. But then it is shown, if possible still more clearly, that the field is all in all (ix, 42 ff.). Vasishṭha, xvii, 6 ff., does no more than give the for and against; Āpast., ii, 6, 13.6 f. and Baudhāyana, ii, 2, 3.33 decide that the seed is the decisive thing (the son belongs to the begetter). Nārada, xiii, 17, and Parāçara, iv, 20 f. hold the opposite opinion; for according to Parāçara not only the kuṇḍa (son of the adulteress) but also the golaka (widow's bastard) belongs to the husband, and Nārada also names the kānīna, sahoḍha, and gūḍhaja as son and heir of the husband. So also MBh. K, xiii, 84.9–12. Moreover Parāçara in iv, 22 gives only four classes of sons: aurasa, kshetraja, datta, kṛitrima. But all twelve can be brought under these. The Mahānirvāṇatantra teaches as to the kānīna, golaka, and kuṇḍa that they are like the atipātakin, cannot inherit, and do not bring uncleanness by their death, that they are therefore utter outsiders (xii, 82). Cp. Bṛihaspati, xxv, 41; Yājñav., i, 222 ff. It is a statement often found that he that is sprung of a begetting by proxy must—naturally in an emergency—bring the offering to

If thus the many kinds of sons whom the wife has gathered elsewhere have their fixed place, recognized by law, in the husband's family, it is probably due in the first place to the Indian passion for systematizing and their worship of tradition, and respect for the usage of different districts. That which once had been stated as a principle was dragged on faithfully down through the centuries, nay through thousands of years. But on the other hand the life to-day of our civilized mankind also, for instance, would really offer without a doubt quite as much, if not, indeed, far more, foundation for suchlike codifying of the fruits of women's freedom in love. To speak only of one thing, it is no wonder that, in a land where sons—whether begotten by a man himself or not—meant so much, a man was often inclined just to enjoy such fruits without letting himself be worried over the question of whence the life-bringing pollen might have been wafted for them. We are not to draw from this the conclusion of a remarkable lack of morals, not even for earlier times. The Epic, anyhow, gives no sure foundation whatever for such an assumption. It is true that in many regards the ethical feeling was still raw and undeveloped; for it the woman, indeed, was usually only a chattel ; but of this we shall speak by and by. But is it truly any better among ourselves who have progressed so wonderfully ?

Now there were, indeed, in the India of the Epic, too, people who did not wish for any children, and in the Mahābh. (xii, 331.16, cp. 20) astonishment finds expression at the strange way of the world, that they who wished not for children should get them, while to others who yearned for them with all their heart they were denied.[1] But married folk undoubtedly

the forefathers for both men, his begetter and the husband of his mother, and is heir to them both. Cp. also Caland, *Ahnenkult*, 28, 193 (how the son born out of wedlock takes the ancestral gift away from his real father and bestows it on his father by law). See especially also J. J. Meyer, Kauṭilya, pp. 765–767 ; *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, 224 f. ; 315 ; 343.

[1] The passage is noteworthy in many ways. The poet wonders at the remarkable course of the world, whose tangled riddles are insoluble from the empirical standpoint, but can perhaps be explained by metaphysics. The sinner and the fool grow old in pleasure and

thriving, for the good man and the capable things go badly, and so on. "To the one man, who sits still and does not stir, happiness comes, the other runs along after toil, and does not reach that which is utterly beyond his grasp. Make it known unto me from man's own (empirical) nature wherein he makes his mistake. [Probably what is meant is: explain to me from his personality or nature, as determined by the karman; cp. xii, 290.13; 301.24.] The seed that came into being at one place (in the man) goes over to another (into the woman). If it has been set into the womb, then a fruit of the body comes into being, or none; we become aware that we vanish like the mango-blossom [liter., whose disappearance, that is like the mango-blossom, is perceived; the blossom is lost and leaves a fruit behind it, or does not; even so is it with the seed of man. Thus, if we read nivṛittir instead of the nirvṛittir often confused with it. If this latter is kept to, then the meaning is the same: "whose growth is perceived as like unto that of the mango-blossom"]. For some persons that yearn for the continuation of the line, and strive to bring this about, no ovum comes into being, and to others who start back from pregnancy as from an angry snake a lusty boy is born. How then has he come into being, as though out of death? Poor fools that yearn for sons make sacrifices to the gods, undertake penances, and then shameful slurs for their family are born unto them, carried for ten months in the womb. Others are born into money and corn, and all kinds of things of delight gathered together by their fathers, have fallen to the share (of their parents) through these very happiness-bringing things (cp. iii, 209.11 ff.). The two having drawn nigh unto one another, a fruit of the body comes into the womb, like an intruding misfortune, at the union in the pleasure of love [perhaps: in just as inexplicable wise. I read yoniṃ, which is confirmed by K. But possibly the somewhat unusual yoni is older: "a bodily fruit of the womb comes into being"]. Dost thou see through what pains the fruit of the body lives, deposited by pure chance as an unconscious drop of seed in the womb, (the fruit) which (as a soul again embodied), separated (from its earlier abode) with other bodies, cut off from its earlier source with the bearer of a body (that is, with a new being), stirring in flesh and slime at (that is, after) the ending of its (earlier) life, is bound up with a (new) living person, after being burnt, indeed, in one body with another moving or unmoving body, and perishes when this (body) perishes in the end, like a little ship that is fastened to another one (cp. Meyer, Kauṭilya, addit. 56.47)? [I read with K. çīrṇaṃ instead of çīghraṃ on purely stylistic grounds, and take çarīriṇaṃ, prāṇinaṃ, and paradehaṃ as accusatives depending on āhitaṃ; of course çarīriṇaṃ and prāṇinaṃ could also be referred

were at least only very seldom in the first set. And if married men and women were granted offspring, then they proved thankful, too, especially, of course, if it was male offspring. Just as the Old Indian literature in general stands out through its pictures of the tenderest family life, so the Epic gives us, too, beautiful glimpses into this delightful world. We have a very sweet song on the happiness of family and children from the lips of a woman in the words of Çakuntalā (i, 74). She first paints a glowing picture for King Dushyanta of the true wife and the blessing she brings; then she goes on (çl. 53 ff.): "When the son runs up to his father, covered with the earth's dust (in which he has been playing), and clasps his limbs, what could there be more glorious than that! . . . Not the touching of garments nor of beautiful women nor of water is to compare, is so pleasing as the touching of the son who is being clasped. The Brahman is best among the two-footed, the cow excels most among the four-footed, the best among the revered is the teacher, the son is the fairest of all that men touch. . . . Yes, men, when they have gone into another village, (at their home-coming) joyfully welcome their children, taking them, lovingly onto their lap and smelling their heads.[1] And the

to the accus. garbhaṃ, but there is very much to be said against this]. Why, in that very belly where food and drink, and the solid dishes that have been eaten are dissolved by the digestion, is not the fruit of the body dissolved just like the nourishment taken? [Cp. xii, 253.11; Mārk.-Pur., x, 5; Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes*, etc., iii, p. 124.] The course of the urine and fæces in the body has been laid down by our very nature; none here is a free agent, whether he wishes to withhold or to discharge. Sometimes also the fruits of the body come out of the belly before their time, being so born, and other times likewise they fall to destruction when they have to come into the world [or agame na written separately: "others on the contrary do not thus fall to destruction at their coming into the world," that is, are happily born]". All connected with the origin of life is therefore a secret, throned in the darkness of nature. None has the power here to arrange things as he might wish them.

[1] In the Epic, too, this Eastern, and especially Indian, sign of tenderness is mentioned over and over again. In Rām., vii, 71.12 we read: "I will smell thee on the head; that is the greatest sign of tender love" (snehasya parā gatiḥ). Cp. Meyer, Kauṭilya, 11.26 ff.

twice-born utter this set of sayings, which are in the Veda, at the birth ceremony for sons, and this is known to thee :

Thou art begotten limb from limb,
Thou art born from the heart,
Thou art the self, that son is called ;
Live thou a hundred autumns !

My life hangs from thine,
On thee hangs the everlasting span of the race ;
Therefore, mayest thou, my son, in happiness high
Live a hundred autumns long ! [1]

From thy limbs this one (my son) came into being, from the man another man ; see, as in a clear lake, thy second self in the son. As the sacrificial fire (āhavanīya) is fetched from the fire of the master of the house (gārhapatya), so did this one arise out of thee ; thou, that wast one, art become twofold." [2]

The already mentioned Brahman who is to bring the cart-load of rice as tribute to the evil Rākshasa, and then be eaten together with the steers by the monster, bewails his wife and children (i, 157.26 ff.) : " Thou knowest, O Brahman woman, once I did strive to go away elsewhere, where there is peace and plenty, but thou didst not hearken unto me. ' Here I was born and grew up, and my father likewise.' So didst thou speak in thy foolishness, when more than once I besought thee. Thy old father has gone into heaven, and thy mother, too, long ago ; thy kinsfolk have been and are gone ; what joy hast

[1] See the Gṛihyasūtras : Hiraṇy., ii, 1, 3.2 ; Gobhila, ii, 7, 21. Āçval., i, 15, 3.9. Pārask., i, 16, 18 ; 18, 2 ; Baudhāyana's law book, ii, 2, 3.14.

[2] The Christian Fathers of the Church of the first centuries disputed among themselves whether the soul had existed from all time (Pre-existants), or whether God made it at the begetting (Creationists), or whether it came from the father, as one light is lit at another (Traducianists). Among the Indians neither the second nor the third of these doctrines was able to emerge. And yet they often show this very Traducianist comparison. Thus Kālidāsa says in Raghuv., v, 37 : " It was the same mighty form (Aja's as his father Raghu's), the same natural majesty ; the boy differed not from his cause, like a light that has been lit at the light." Of course that only refers to the origin of the body. Cp. MBh., xii, 210.26.

thou then in dwelling here? Filled with loving yearning for thy family thou wast, and since thou didst not hearken to my words, thy family now perishes, which brings great sorrow on me, or I now lose my life. For I cannot yield up any of mine, remaining myself alive like one without pity. Thou hast carried out the holy duties with me, thou art kind, always to me as a mother, thou art the friend whom the gods have appointed unto me, always my surest refuge, robbed of father and mother,[1] ever busied with household cares. Thee I did woo in prescribed fashion, and thee I then led round the fire with holy prayers. Thou comest of good family, art endowed with virtuous ways, and hast borne me children. Thee, my good wife, who never dost hurt me, and art ever obedient to me, I could not yield up to save my own life.—How could I myself give up my daughter, a child, who has not yet come to the flower of youth, and whose form does not yet bear the marks of sex, who has been entrusted me by the high-souled Maker, like a pledge for her future husband. How could I forsake her, from whom I together with my forefathers hope for the worlds made ready by the daughters' sons, her whom I myself begot? Many there are who hold that the father's love for the son is the greater, others the love for the daughter; for me both are alike.[2] Even though I give myself up, I shall suffer torment in the other world too, for left behind by me, these (my family) it is evident, cannot live here. To

[1] I read vihīnāṃ instead of vihitāṃ, which perhaps may have come from the preceding line of verse. It must be said, however, that K. also has vihitāṃ, and this is likewise clear, though not very good: Prepared, brought up, destined by father and mother (to be combined with what follows).

[2] According to Rām., i, 61.19 the father loves the eldest, the mother the youngest son, which agrees with Jāt., v, p. 327 ff. Of the great love of the Hindus for their children we have very plentiful evidence. Here we give one or two cases only: A. W. Stratton, *Letters from India*, Lond., 1908, p. 99, to be compared with Çrīvara's Kathākautukam ed. R. Schmidt, iv, 86; Fuller, *Studies of Indian Life*, etc., 162; Dubois-Beauchamp, 307 f. (but according to the last passage only a foolish fondness, which is very ill requited by the children, which statement, if made universally, seems wholly groundless).

yield up one of them is cruel and reprobated by the wise ones ; and if I give myself up, then without me they will die." See especially also xiv, 90.24 ff.

Rāma cries out (Rām., ii, 111.9–10) : "The way the father and mother deal constantly by the child, what the father and mother do to it, it is very hard to requite them for [1] ; they give it whatever they can, they lull it to sleep, they rub its body with oil, they speak ever loving words to it, and rear it." Cp. MBh., xiii, 14.112 ff. ; above all 132 f.

Bitter, therefore, was the sorrow when death took a child with it. Such pictures are often drawn in Indian literature, but generally, it is true, with an emphatic stressing of the foolishness of such grief in a world where all is fleeting and mortal. Here the inconsolable mother, Kisagotamī has won renown. An edifying legend, which was perhaps only later touched up to glorify Çiva, but is very beautiful, makes up the content of xii, 153 :

The son of a Brahman, who had been gotten after much trouble, had died while still a child with great eyes, seized by a demon of children's sickness. Filled with sorrow, his own took him, and bore him, that was all to his family, weeping and overcome by woe, out to the field of the dead. And as now with the dead darling on their arm they went along sobbing, they kept on telling one another everything he had said while he was still alive (cp. iii, 298.8). Outside in the place of the dead they laid him down on the earth, but could not part themselves from him. Then a vulture heard them weeping, and came up and spoke : "Thousands of men, and thousands of women, have brought their kindred hither, and then gone back home. See how the whole world is ruled by pleasure and pain ! Union and separation fall to men in the wheel of change. Those who come here, indeed, with the dead, but go back without them,[2] they themselves go hence with the fastset measure of the length of their lives. No one was ever awakened again to life, when once he had fallen before the law of time, beloved

[1] Cp. Manu, ii, 227.

[2] After ye na add gṛihītvā. K. reads more smoothly : ye 'nuyānti (152.10). Kālena in çl. 8 probably means : in the course of time. It might also = (brought hither) by fate, etc.

or hated—this is the lot of the living. The world stops from its daily task, the sun goes home, do ye, too, go back to your abode and let be your love for the child." When now the kindred, wailing in despair, for the child was indeed dead, were about to go forth, there came a jackal, black as a raven's wing, out of his cave and spoke to them : " Mankind knows no compassion. The sun is still in the heavens. The fleeting instant can bring much ; perhaps the child will come back to life again. You have no love for the child, whose words once gladdened your hearts. But see what love the beasts and birds cherish for their young, and yet they have nothing to gain from having them. They, who are filled with loving attachment, and see their pleasure in their young, have not, as the Munis and they who carry out the business of sacrifice,[1] when they go over into the other world any advantage either here on earth or in the life beyond, and yet they love and cherish their offspring. Look on him long with love. How could you go and leave him, that had such lively, great lotus-eyes, and whom you bathed like a newly wedded man, and decked out with every ornament ? " Then they all went back to the dead child. The vulture once again began : " Why do you bewail the dead child, who feels no longer, and why not yourselves ? Leave sorrow and the dead one, and do good with all your strength. What a man does, be it pure or dreadful, that he does enjoy ; what have kinsfolk to do there ? " The jackal answered : " By manly deeds and untiringness men reach the goal and happiness. Whither then will ye go, and leave behind in the forest here him that came into being [2] through your own flesh, the body which is the half of your body, him that carries on the line for the forefathers ? " The vulture spoke : " I have now been living over a thousand years, and I have never yet seen one dead brought back to life. They die in the mother's womb, they die at once after birth, they die when they walk about,[3]

[1] Muniyajñakriyām instead of muniyajñakriyāṇām, with the genitive ending for consonantal stems, in the Vedic way.

[2] Literally : " Came up here," at the begetting, of course. Boehtlingk's reading is wrong.

[3] Of course : when they can walk (cańkramantas). Cp. çl. 45 ; vi, 10.7.

and others in the bloom of youth. Whether it be a moving or an unmoving being, its span of life is already laid down at the beginning. Torn away from the much-loved wife, filled with grief for the child, burning with sorrow, people are ever going from here (from the place of the dead) home. This love is useless, this wearing oneself out is fruitless. This one there sees not with his eyes, hears not with his ears; he has become as a block of wood. The pain is doubled, if we dwell on the doings of the dead one, and call them up into memory." The jackal ran up and said: "There is no ending [1] for love, nor for wailing and weeping. If ye leave this dead one, sorrow is sure for you. As before now dead persons have come to life again, so too may a holy man, wise in magic, or a godhead take pity on you." At these words they came back to the dead body, laid its head on their lap, and wept bitterly. But the vulture reminded them: "He is all wet with your tears, and is tormented by the touch of your hand,[2] and yet through the working of the god

[1] Literally: no abolishing.

[2] Jul. von Negelein, "Die Reise d. Seele ins Jenseits," *Ztschr. d. Ver. f. Volksk.*, Bd. 11, p. 16 ff., 149 ff., 263 ff. shows the widespread belief: (1) that the soul stands in relation with the body even after death; (2) that it stays on at first in the neighbourhood of the body, but for a very variously estimated time; (3) that in the body, so long as it has not decayed, there abides a potential life. As to the last point mention might also be made of India: "So long as even only a bone is there, the dead man enjoys glory in the world of heaven." Cp. Caland, *Toten- u. Bestattungsgebräuche*, 107, 109. That it was thought in certain cases at least that the soul was still in the dead man's body is well seen, too, from the custom of splitting the skull with a coco-nut, that the spirit of life might escape. But it is not true to say with Negelein: "According to the teaching of the Vedic ritual books the soul of the dead man stays along with the body for a time" (pp. 22–23), and to bring forward so confidently as proof Hillebrandt, *Rituallit.* 90 and (seemingly taken from Hillebrandt) Oldenberg, *Rel. d. Veda*, 555, and Caland, *Ahnenkult*, 22. The last-named citation is moreover some mistake in Hillebrandt. But Caland, *Toten- u. Bestattungsgebräuche*, 166, perhaps means to say that at the time when the body was buried the dead man's earthly wrapping was still looked on as the abode of his soul. Our passage in the Epic is particularly worthy of note on this point, and so also Mārkaṇḍeyapur., x, 70 f.:

of Justice has been sunk into the long sleep. All of us must die. Shun all that is evil, and do all that is good. He that sees

" When the body (of the dead man) is burned, he feels a strong glow, and when it is beaten, torment, and when it is cut up, very awful torment. When (the body) is moistened, the (dead) person suffers very long-lasting pain through the ripening of his deeds, although he has gone into another body." Still more remarkable, perhaps, is the tale of the king's young son whose soul and its life is still so fully stirring in the buried body. Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes*, etc., iii, p. 218. That the man whose soul is gone feels what is done to his body is indeed a view which is found in various places, and in agreement with the passages just named the dead man, according to Mohammedan belief suffers under the wailing of his kindred. Negelein, p. 24. The soul is looked on, indeed, by the Moslem as united with the body before the burial, and also for the first night in the grave. Garnett, *The Women of Turkey*, etc., ii, 492 ; 495 f. ; Lane, *Arabian Society*, etc., 263 ; M. Horten, *Die relig. Gedankenwelt d. Volkes im heut. Islam*, pp. 280, 284 f. We are even told of them : " For a whole year the bond lasts between the spirit and the body laid in the grave." Negelein, p. 25. (Though I have not been able to look up his authority. But see M. Horten, loc. cit., 296–300.) This reminds us of the Indian doctrine that the dead man only reaches Yama's city after a full year has gone by. A very general idea is that the dead man goes on staying a shorter or a longer time in his former house, or near to it ; indeed, even those who have been taken among the " fathers "—to say nothing of the Pretas—are well known in India to approach the offerings to the forefathers ; and in particular " one day in the year is free for the dead ", in the middle of the rainy season ; then Yama lets all his subjects go off to the world of men. Caland, *Totenverehrung*, 43–46. See also Dubois-Beauchamp [3], p. 488 ; Vasishṭha, xi, 39 f. ; Vishṇu, lxxviii, 51–53 ; Mārk.-Pur., x, 75 ; Garuḍapurāṇasārod., i, 55. According to the two last the dead man is allowed to stay twelve days longer near his former abode, and take his nourishment from the pious gifts ; then he is led away to Yama's city ; Dubois speaks of ten. The difference is probably to be explained by the varying length of the " uncleanness " of the kindred, depends, that is, first of all on the caste. See Caland, *Toten- und Bestattungsgebräuche*, 81–84, also in Dubois ; Crooke, *Anthropos*, v, p. 461 (five days among the Baidyas in south Kanara, cp. 463). Further matter in Negelein ; then Sartori, *Ztschr. d. Ver. f. Volksk.*, Bd. 18, p. 375 ; Sartori, ibid., Bd. 4, p. 424 ; Krauss, ibid., Bd. 2, p. 180 at bottom ; Krauss, *Slav. Volkforschungen*, p. 111 ; Freiligrath's *Gesicht des Reisenden*, etc.

not (does not heed, neglects) father and mother, kindred, and friends, who are still alive, he has broken the moral law.[1] He that no longer sees with his eyes, nor stirs at all, that has reached his goal and end—what will you do for him by weeping?" When the two beasts had been disputing with one another and harrowing the poor people a little longer, Çiva came, urged on by his wife, and gave them the choice of a boon. They spoke: "Give back life again to this only son, and thereby to us, too." And the god fulfilled their prayer, and granted him that had risen again to live hundreds of years. Thus was the sorrow of the wailers turned to joy, and hastening they came back into the city with the child.

Like them, the old blind king Dhṛitarāshṭra, wringing his hands, and sighing so deeply that a mist, as it were, rises from him, bewails the death of his sons, fallen on the battle-field (ix, 2): "When I think of their youth and of their childish play, of all the slain sons, then my heart is bursting. Since with my want of eyes I have not seen their form, that love springing from tenderness towards children was kept ever for them. When I heard how they were coming beyond childhood's years, were entering on the bloom of youth, were reaching the middle years of life, I was filled with joy. When now I learn that they are cut down, robbed of their lordship and of their strength, I find rest nowhere, overwhelmed by my soul's anguish for my sons. Come, come, my son, to me who am shelterless! How shall it be for me without thee! Thou that wast the refuge of thy kindred and friends, whither wilt thou go, leaving me behind, an old, blind man? Who will now say: 'Father dear' to me, when I have risen? Put thine arms around my neck once more with eyes dimmed with love, and speak those good words to me: 'Bid me!'"

So, too, calls out Bharadvāja from his tortured soul when his only son is slain: "Happy indeed are the men to whom no son is born, who go their way at their pleasure, without knowing the sorrow for a child" (iii, 137.16). This, however, is but one note from that song which wails and triumphs through the

[1] Or: For them that see not mother and father, kindred, and friends, who are still alive (that is, for the dead) the moral law has come to an end (disappeared, towards them there is no need, therefore, to observe it)?

whole post-Vedic literature : " He only is happy that calls nought his own." [1]

And the parent's heart in Old India often quavered for the child still living, especially if it was the only one. On this an excellent tale was told (iii, 127 f.) : " There was a pious king, Somaka by name. He had a hundred wives of his own rank. But in spite of every most strenuous endeavour the prince had no son by them even after a long time. One day among his hundred wives there was then born to the old man, who used every care and endeavour, a son named Jantu. When he had seen the light of day, all his mothers constantly circled round him, and turned their backs on all wishes and pleasures. An ant now once bit Jantu on the buttocks, and at the bite the child called out loudly with pain. Then all his mothers screamed in violent distress, standing quickly in a ring round Jantu ; there was a great uproar. These cries of distress were suddenly heard by the ruler of the earth, as he sat in the midst of the council of his ministers with his sacrificial priest. The lord of the earth sent and asked : ' What is that ? ' The door-keeper told him what had happened to his son. Quickly Somaka, the queller of his foes, rose up with his councillors, went off to the women's apartments, and soothed his son. When the prince had soothed his son, he left the women's apartments, and seated himself together with his sacrificial priest and his ministers of state. Somaka spoke : ' Grievous

[1] When all his sons are snatched away from the holy man Vasishṭha, he becomes a kind of Old Indian Ahasuerus : he resolves to die, and throws himself from the cliff, but falls as though onto a heap of cotton. He goes into the blazing fire, and to him the flame is cool. He hangs a stone on his neck and leaps into the sea, but the waves cast him ashore (i, 176.41 ff., cp. 177, espec. 177.16 ; 178.2). As an instructive counterpart an American Indian Ahasuerus may be given here : A son is beaten by his father, and goes into the forest. After he has wandered a long time he comes to a place where a lot of wood has piled itself up. He wants to die, and leaps from the pile into the water, but comes up to the surface again safe and sound. Then he comes to a steep cliff. He climbs up and throws himself down, but is still quite unharmed (Boas, *Ztschr. f. Ethnol.*, " Abhandl. d. anthrop. Gesellsch.," Bd. 24, p. 406).

it is, when a man has but one son on earth ! It were better to have no son. Since beings are always shadowed by suffering, it is a sorrow to have only one son.[1] When I had carefully picked myself out these hundred wives of equal birth with me, I took them home that I might have sons. And now they have no children ! One son has come into being with trouble and care, this my Jantu, by the exertion of all. What sorrow could now be greater ! The vigorous age has now departed from me and my wives. Their life and mine rests on this one little son of mine. Is there now a work that were such as to give me a hundred sons, whether through a great, or a small deed, or one hard to carry out ? ' The sacrificial priest spoke : ' There is such a work whereby thou wouldst have a hundred sons. If thou canst do it, then I will speak, Somaka.' Somaka spoke : ' Be it possible or impossible, that by which I get a hundred sons, it is already done. Know that, O glorious one ; tell it unto me ! ' The sacrificial priest spoke : ' Sacrifice Jantu, O king, in a sacrifice carried out by me, then thou wilt speedily have a hundred splendid sons for thine own. If his retina is offered up in the fire, and his mothers smell the smoke, they will bear sons mighty and strong as heroes. But their son will come into being again in his own (bodily) mother. And on his left side he will bear a golden birthmark.' Somaka spoke : ' Brahman, even as this must be carried out, so indeed do thou carry it out. In my longing for sons I will obey all thy words.' Then for Somaka he sacrificed this Jantu. But his mothers tore him away [2] by force, filled with pity, wailing in their burning sorrow : ' Woe, we are death's,' weeping bitterly and seizing him by the right hand. But the sacrificial priest seized him by the left hand, and so dragged and tore the child away from them, who wailed like she-eagles of the sea. And having cut him up according to the precept, he offered up the retina of his eye in the fire. When the retina was offered up in the fire, and the mothers smelt the smoke, they fell in

[1] One son and one eye is something and is nothing ; both can so easily get lost. K i, 107.69.

[2] K. again touches it up, and has pratyakarshan. Apākarshuḥ is anyhow from kṛish.

tortures suddenly onto the ground, and all these exquisite women there received a fruit of the body. Ten months afterwards the gift of a full hundred sons was made by these wives together to Somaka. Jantu was born first, and from his own mother [1]; he was the much beloved for them all, not so their own children; and that golden birthmark was on his right side, and among these hundred sons he was the first too in qualities. Then that Guru (teacher, high priest) of Somaka went into the other world. And in the course of time Somaka, too, went into the other world. There he saw him scorching in the dreadful hell. He asked him: 'Wherefore dost thou scorch in hell, O Brahman?' Then his Guru, who was being sore tortured by the fire, spoke unto him: 'I have made sacrifice for thee, O king, this is the fruit of that work.' When the royal Ṛishi had heard this, he spoke to the king of justice (to Yama, the lord of the dead and of hell): 'I will go in there. Set thou my sacrificial priest free! For it is for my sake that the excellent one is being burned by hell fire.' Yama spoke: 'None other but the doer ever enjoys the fruit of the work. Here (in heaven) the fruits of *thy* deeds are seen, O best of those that speak.' Somaka spoke: 'I crave not for the holy and heavenly worlds without the knower of the Veda, only with him will I dwell in the abode of the gods or in hell, O king of justice; for I am the same as he is in the work. Let the fruit of the good or of the evil work be alike then for us both.' Yama spoke: 'If thou so wishest, O king, then enjoy together with him the fruit of the work which he reaps, and for the same length of time. After that thou wilt come unto the place of the good.' Then did the lotus-eyed king do this all, and when his sin was blotted out, he was set free from there with his Guru. He came together with this Guru into that pure heavenly joy which he had won for himself through his deeds, he who loved his Guru." [2]

[1] That the dead child appears again in the one born next is a widespread belief. Here we will only refer to Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, i, 209 f.; 218; 221; 226 ff.; 230 ff.; 242 ff.

[2] For the sacrificing of the one child so as to get many, cp. Hopkins, *The Fountain of Youth*, JAOS, 26, p. 6; Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes*, etc., i, 127; ii, 171.

In the same way as this sonless man, so, too, his fellow-king in Old India, Çāntanu, the father of Bhīshma, declares : " To have one son is to have none " (i, 100.67 ; cp. " one son is no son, the wise say " v, 147. 18). More moderate than these fathers, carried away, manlike, by their feelings, is Lopamudrā, the princess and wife of a beggar : her husband, Agaſtya, mighty in penance and digeſtive powers, leaves her the choice of having a thousand or a hundred or ten sons, or only one, who shall be equal in worth to thousands. She shares the view already known from the Hitopadeça, and chooses the one son (iii, 99.20 ff.).

And the children repay, too, this tenderness of their parents : no land and no people shows a more beautiful attitude of children to parents, and few can show one to be compared at all to that in India. Witness is borne to this in the Epic, too, and innumerable times. Here only a few examples are given.

The youthful penitent mortally wounded by Daçaratha through a miſtake, bewails really only his old blind father and mother, whom up till now he has supported and cared for, and who without him are loſt,[1] and then comes transfigured out of Indra's heaven, into which he, the son of the Vaiçya man and Çūdrā woman, has gone owing to his good deeds towards his parents, to the broken couple, and consoles them by telling them that they are soon to join him (Rām., ii, 63–64). One of the moſt pleasing figures in the Mahābh. is the dharma-vyādha, the pious butcher, to whom father and mother are the divinity, Brahman, Veda, and sacrifice, who lovingly honours and cares for them, and through his bearing towards them reaches the loftieſt perfection. Although only a Çūdra, he brings a proud Brahman penitent, who has run away from his parents, back to his duty towards them, to that greateſt form of piety (iii, 207 ff., especially 214 and 215).[2]

One day, King Çāntanu is going along in the foreſt. There he smells an incomparably sweet scent. He follows it up, and finds a fisherman's daughter, the Satyavatī already known to us, who looks after her foſter-father's ferry-boat, and thus

[1] Cp. Jāt., vi, p. 76 ff.
[2] Cp. Çukasaptati, the main tale.

has had the adventure leading to the birth of Vyāsa, and at the same time to her fragrant smell. By her divine beauty, her sweet charm, and her indescribable fragrance a burning love is kindled in him, and he asks her of her foster-father, the fisherman. But this latter will only give his consent if the king promises him on oath that the son of the pair shall be king without any rival. Now as Çāntanu has already a splendid scion, the Bhīshma born of Gaṅgā, and has already consecrated him as heir to the throne, he will not do so. "Burning with hot love, his mind darkened with passion, thinking only of the fisherman's daughter, he went back to Hāstinapura." Then Bhīshma once saw him thus grieving and asked him why he was always thus pining in sorrow, why he was pale and haggard and always deep in thought; he would know, he said, his sorrow, and help him. "But Çāntanu, the father, could not disclose to the son this unavowable love of his for the fisherman's daughter." [1] He said: "Thou art the only son in a warrior race, and ever busied with warlike things; therefore wilt thou fall in the fight. And, indeed, all things in the world are thus fleeting. I do not wish for myself to marry a second time, but I wish to do so that the line may not die out." Then Bhīshma went to the old minister of his father, and asked him. From his lips he learned the details.[2] At once the noble son with old Kshattriyas sought out that fisherman, and asked on his father's behalf for Satyavatī's hand. Her foster-father granted that this was a highly honourable match, and that King Çāntanu had already been named to him by the maiden's real father as a worthy husband, and so the divine Ṛishi Asita, who was violently in love and was seeking her hand, had had to withdraw rebuffed. But as a father he had to point out, he said, that the son of these two would not be able to stand up against so mighty a rival as Bhīshma. Bhīshma then before all the witnesses solemnly renounced his father's throne. But the fisherman, like a prudent adviser, then reminded them that even then Bhīshma's offspring would make a claim. Now did the good son make the awful vow: "From to-day onwards

[1] This sentence according to K. (107.63). It is not absolutely needed.

[2] In K. (107.76 ff.) he learns everything through a long conversation with his father's Sūta.

I shall live in utter chastity, and the imperishable worlds in heaven will fall to the sonless one's lot." In great joy the fisherman now gave his consent. At once Bhīshma made request: "Come up into my chariot, mother; we will drive home." He brought his father the bride, and the father for his hard deed granted him the boon of only having to die when he wished it himself (i, 100.45 ff.; cp. v, 172.17–19; 173.5; vi, 14.2; 120.14).[1]

But the most famous example of a child's love is probably Rāma. Everything is ready for his being consecrated as heir to the throne, when his step-mother, Kaikeyī, who at first with a joyous love for him has approved of all, but has then been goaded on by the hunchbacked, spiteful serving-woman, makes a stubborn protest, and wants to see her own son consecrated as the king's successor; Rāma for safety is to go off for fourteen years into the forest of banishment. Since the old king Daçaratha on the one hand is passionately devoted to her, but on the other is also bound by his earlier solemn promise of favour, he does not, indeed, agree, and even bitterly remonstrates with her, but he cannot meet her with the needful resolute negative. When Rāma learns what is happening, he is at once ready, and his only sadness is that his father does not speak to him. Among other things he says: "I should not wish to live a moment, if I were not gladdening the great king, if I were not obeying my father's words, if the prince were angered with me. How should a man act wrongly against him in whom he sees the root of his own life, and who is the visible godhead? (Rām., ii, 18.15–16). At the king's bidding I would leap into the fire or the sea, and I would eat strong poison (ii, 18.29–30). There is no practice of virtue which were greater than obedience to the father (ii, 19.22). What is the good of our seeking by every means the favour of fortune, which lies not in our hands, and neglecting what we have in our hands: father and mother and teacher!" (ii, 30.33). Lakshmaṇa, who is devoted with a most heartfelt love to his injured brother, uses, indeed, in his anger words other than these, and

[1] There is something very much the same from the history of the Rajputs in Tod, *Rajasthan*, i, 295 ff.; 415–416; ii, 144.

very unusual with Indian sons. He chides the tottering old fool, blinded by love of women, wants to bind and if needs be even kill his father, to stir up a rising against him, and so on. But Rāma calms him, speaks kind words to Kaikeyī and of her ; he says that she who did after all so love him cannot be guilty, but that fate is driving her on against her will ; he even spurs on Lakshmaṇa to stop without any delay all preparations for the consecration, that her suspicious, painful anxiety about her own son's happiness may at once be set at rest. But now he finds himself in a conflict of duties, which, however, does not unduly disturb him : his mother Kauçalyā declares she will on no account give him leave to go off into the forest, and she puts it to him thus : " Obedient to his mother, with chastened soul, dwelling at home, Kāçyapa won the highest ascetic merit, and came into heaven. Just as the king, so must I, too, be honoured by thee with deep respect. Parted from thee, life and fortune is nothing to me ; by thy side, to eat grass only is the greatest weal. If thou leave me behind overcome with sorrow, and go into the forest, then I shall starve myself to death ; in such wise as that I cannot go on living." But Rāma makes it clear to her by the examples of the old Ṛishis that the father's bidding must always be unconditionally fulfilled. She is as one dead in her sorrow, and insists : " As thy father, so also am I a Guru for thee because of my right and my love.[1] What can life mean to me without thee, what can the world mean, or the food of the dead or of the gods ! An instant near thee is more to me than even the whole world of the living." When Rāma heard the woeful plaint of his mother, he burned once more in torture like a mighty elephant that is scared by men with fire-brands, and hurls itself once more into the

[1] So too, for instance, Nārada, xii, 59 declares : " The fruit of the field cannot be born without the field, nor without seed, therefore in law the child belongs to the father and the mother " ; and according to Parāçara, vii, 6 the giving away of the daughter is the right of the following three : the mother, the father, the eldest brother. This is in harmony with the well-known Vetāla tale of the three wooers and the maiden that was killed by a snake's bite, but called back to life again by magic. Cp. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, 227 f.

darkness." [1] But in spite of all he wavered not ; he showed her that Daçaratha it was who was in authority over them both, and that he would come back himself, and gladden her heart (Rām., ii, 21).

[1] The elephant scared with fire-brands is very often found as a comparison in the Epic. So, iv, 48.12 ; vii, 22.14 ; 109.12 ; viii, 50.42 ; 80.26 ; ix, 17.4 ; xi, 18.25 ; Rām., ii, 27.54 ; vi, 13.19 ; 24.38.

V

Woman as Mother

AT the centre point in this intimate family life is the mother, covered with much glory by Indian literature; and, as has been already pointed out, to the Hindu it is just this side of a woman's life that is the beginning and the end. Woman as a mother takes up in the Epic, too, an important place.

In Mahābh., i, 196.16 we find: "Of all guru the mother is the highest guru"; in xii, 342.18: "There is no higher virtue (or: no higher law) than the truth, no guru to equal the mother, a greater thing for weal than the Brahmans is found neither here nor there" (cp. xiii, 63.92); in xiii, 105.14: "Above ten fathers or even the whole earth in worth (gaurava) stands the mother; there is no guru like the mother"[1] (cp. 106.65). Cp. iii, 313.60; xii, 301.44. For all curses there are means of averting and destroying (pratighāta, moksha), but for the mother's, and hers only, there are none (i, 37.3–5).[2] Indeed,

[1] The spiritual master (ācārya) stands above ten private teachers (upādhyāya) in worth and dignity, the father above a hundred spiritual masters, but the mother above a thousand fathers. Manu, ii, 145; Vasishṭha, xiii, 48. Cp. MBh., xii, 108.16 f.; K, xiv, 110.60. Also according to Yājñav., i, 35 and Gautama, ii, 51, the mother stands at the head of the venerable ones (guru), and above priests and religious teachers. To the "golden rules which the teacher gives the disciple to take with him on life's way" belong the following in the old sacred Upanishad: "Honour thy mother like a god. Honour thy father like a god. Honour thy teacher like a god. Honour the guest like a god." (Taitt.-Up., i, 9.1, 2; Deussen, *Sechzig Upaṇishad d. Veda*, p. 222.) The mother comes first here also, as, indeed, in the Sanskrit compound it is always; "mother and father", and never "father and mother". If the two are united by "and" then, on the other hand, it is oftener the other way. The mother is more venerable than the father because she has carried the child, and had to suffer pain. K., vol. i, p. 212, line 1.

[2] So also Mārkaṇḍeyapur., cvi, 28. Though according to lxxvii, 31 there has never yet been such a thing as a mother forgetting her love and cursing her own child. Cp. cvi, 32.

xii, 161.9 states: "There is no pious exercise either in the world or in the ascetics' forest that can stand above the mother (nāti mātaram āçramaḥ)." Yudhishṭhira in xii, 108 asks Bhīshma: "What is the highest of all duties (virtues, law precepts, dharma)?"; and he gets the answer: "The honouring of mother, father, and teacher (guru) I set high; whoso is diligent about these enjoys the worlds of heaven, and high renown.[1] And the task that these bestow, be it the law, or opposed to the law, that must be done.[2] What they allow is what is right; they are the three worlds, they are the three spheres of duties in life (āçrama), they are the three Vedas, they are the three holy fires. The father is held to be the gārhapatya fire, the mother the southern fire, the teacher the āhavanīya. This fire trinity is the most important. If thou givest the proper heed to these three, then thou shalt win the three worlds; of this world thou wilt unfailingly be master through the rightful behaviour towards thy father, of the world beyond through that towards thy mother, of the Brahma world through that towards thy teacher. Whoso cares for these three has won all three worlds; but whoso cares not for them, his holy deeds are all barren. Whoso does not at all times hold these three venerable ones in high esteem, for him there is no salvation in this world or the other.[3] The mother stands above ten fathers, or even the whole world, in worth (gurutva), there is no guru to equal the mother."[4]

[1] Father, mother, and the guru who brings a man into the knowledge of Brahman are the mahāguru or Very Venerable, the First Masters. Anyone speaking evil words of them or to them must fast five days. Mahānirvāṇat., xi, 145. Atiguru ("Values above all") these three are called in Vishṇusmṛiti, xxxi, 1.

[2] Opposed to this in the Epic is also an often-recurring saying, that a bad guru, walking along evil paths, must be punished (i, 140.54; xii, 55.15 f.; 57.7; 140.48; Rām., ii, 21.13). Cp. MBh., iv, 51.15, and the words, following later, of Bhīshma addressed to Paraçurāma. —With K. read: dharmaṃ dharmaviruddhaṃ vā.

[3] The same teaching in Manu, ii, 228–234; Vishṇu, xxxi; and often elsewhere.

[4] In what follows, it is true, all is nicely touched up again, and the spiritual teacher (ācārya) set high above the mother and father;

Cp. xiii, 104.45. It is even asserted that the mother's origin casts no slur (matṛidosho na vidyate, K., i, 99.6). On the other hand we are also told that the father stands above the mother. According to xii, 297.2 the father is the highest godhead for men, and is above the mother. "The mother is the wallet (for the father's seed), to the father belongs the son; he is his by whom he has been begotten" (i, 74.110).[1] But we have already seen that the mother is the field, and thus the important thing, the seed can be thrown in by anyone; and while the man might wed a woman from a lower caste, it was most strictly forbidden for a woman to lower herself.

How Rāma in a case where his duty towards his father comes into conflict with that towards his mother bears himself as the pattern hero of the Rāmāyaṇa, almost always faithfully Brahmanic, we have already seen. Another example is that Paraçurāma, destroyer of the Kshattriyas, who is so highly glorified by the priestly caste, but who in reality is most repugnant. In the Mahābh. also is related shortly his resolute act towards his mother (iii, 116). Jamadagni, the holy son of that Ṛicīka already mentioned, followed his father's example and wedded a royal princess named Reṇukā. She bore him five sons, of whom the youngest was Rāma with the axe. One day, the sons being away to get fruit, the pious mother went to bathe. There she saw King Citraratha wreathed in lotuses playing in the water with his wives, and her heart was gripped by a longing for him. As a result of this unfaithfulness of hers she came back from the water to the hermitary all wet, with troubled mind, and filled with fear.[2] The penitent saw she had lost her determination, and had been robbed of her holy splendour, that she had sinned, and one after the other be bade his four

these latter are the instrument for the earthly body, while the ācārya brings about the heavenly birth (cp. Manu, ii, 144 ff.; Vishṇu, xxx, 44). And from what has been said before, through him the world of Brahma is won, a doctrine often found in Smṛiti.

[1] Cp. for instance Wilson's Vishnupur. (ed. Hall), vol. iv, p. 133 and note; Bhāgavatapur., ix, 20 f.; Kauṭilya (transl.), 260.3.

[2] K. adds: "having fallen from the air into the Narmadā," which suggests a remarkable variant of this tale.

eldeſt sons, as they came home in turn, to kill the mother. Overcome with confusion,[1] ſtunned, they answered not a word. Therefore did the angry man curse them, and at once they were bereft of reason, like unto dull beaſts. When Rāma appeared, he called on him to slay the sinful woman. Rāma hewed her head off at once with his axe. Then of a sudden the old man's rage passed away, and he left it to his son to wish anything he wanted for himself. The son asked firſt that his mother should wake again to life without remembering what had happened, and that his brothers should be roused to live once more like reasoning men; and this came about.[2]

Less resolute was the behaviour of another in a like case (xii, 266). Gautama, of the family of the Aṅgirases, had a son who pondered everything slowly, set about it slowly, carried it out slowly, wherefore he was called Slow Doer (Cirakāri, Cirakārin, Cirakārika), and short-sighted people who were brisk and sharp called him a blockhead. When his mother one day had been guilty of unfaithfulness to her husband,[3] the holy man went over the heads of his other sons and angrily bid Cirakāri: "Slay thy mother!" After these words the moſt excellent Gautama, beſt among the prayer-mutterers, went off without further thought into the foreſt. Slow Doer said, true to his nature, only after a long while: "Yes," and being a slow doer, he pondered and reflected long: "How shall I contrive to carry out my father's bidding and yet not kill my mother? How shall I not sink down like an evil man in this shifting turmoil of duties?[4] The father's bidding is the higheſt law, my own (the natural) law is to shield my mother;

[1] Probably saṃmohāḥ is the reading, as in K.

[2] Cp. Zachariae, "Goethes Parialegende," *Zschr. d. Ver. f. Volksk.*, xi, 186 ff.; xii, 44 ff.; Thurſton, *Omens and Superſtitions*, etc. (1912), p. 148 f. (intereſting variants).

[3] Her name was Ahalyā. Of her love adventure with Indra more will be said later.

[4] Dharmacchala, lit., deceit of duties, deceit of virtue, seeming virtue, juggling with virtue. The word is often found in the MBh., and generally means a deceitful injuring of virtue, especially under the cover of virtue. So ix, 60.26; xii, 270.12; xiii, 20.13.

and to be a son is to be subject. But what is there then that will not torment me later? Who could ever be happy, if he has killed a woman, and moreover his own mother! And who could ever win calm and peace who has not heeded his father? Not to disregard the father is right and fitting, and it is a firm principle to shield one's mother. Both duties are right and salutary. How can I act, that the matter may not get beyond me? For the father sets his own self in the mother at the begetting, we are told, to keep virtue, good ways, race, and family in being. I here have been made a son by my mother and father; how should I not have the knowledge! Of both I know that they are my origin. That which my father said at the birth ceremony and at the by-ceremony—its confirmation is made complete in the firm resolve to honour my father.[1] The first guru who has nourished and taught a man is the highest law; what a father says is the moral rule set down as fixed even in the Vedas. For the father the son is but a joy, but for the son the father is all; he alone gives as an offering his body and all else there is to give. Therefore a man shall act according to his father's words, and never take thought upon it; mortal sins (pātaka) even are washed away from him who follows his father's bidding. In matters of eating and of other things that are for use, in the instruction and in the whole view of life, at the union with a lord (or with the husband), and at the holy custom of parting the hair the father is the law, the father is heaven, the father is the loftiest asceticism. If the father is made to rejoice, then all the gods rejoice. Those words of blessing are fulfilled for a man which

[1] At the birth ceremony the father says to the son :—

Be thou a stone, be thou an axe,
Be thou gold that is beyond valuing!
Thou art the Veda called "son".
Live a hundred autumns long!

If the father comes home from a journey, he must say to the boy: Thou art born limb from limb, etc., as already given (Āçval., i, 15.9 f.; Pārask., i, 18; Gobh., ii, 8.21; Hiraṇy., ii, 1, 4.16 ff.; Āpast., 15, 12 ff.; Khād., ii, 3, 13 ff.). This according to Nīl. is the by-ceremony, and he says that this precept holds good till the boy is brought to the teacher.

the father utters. It is absolution from all sins when the father finds his joy in him. The bloom loosens itself from the stalk, the fruit from the tree—if the father has to suffer sorrow and pain (through his son), yet because of his tender love for the child he does not loosen himself from the son.[1] Thus then have I pondered the reverence the son owes his father[2]; the father is no small thing. Now will I consider the mother. The cause of this body here with me in the mortal world, and made up of the five elements, is my mother, as that of fire is the rubbing-stick. The mother is the rubbing-stick of the body for mankind, the comfort of all that suffer. If one has a mother, one is sheltered, but unsheltered if one has her not. He does not grieve, age does not weigh on him, even though fortune betray him, who comes back home to his house and can say 'Mother!' And let a man be surrounded by sons and grandsons, and stand at the end of his hundredth year, yet if he takes refuge with his mother, he acts like a child of two years.[3] Whether he is capable or incapable, unimportant or important, the mother protects the son; no other career has been appointed by fate. He is old, he is unhappy, the world is an empty desert for him, if he is parted from his mother. There is no shadow like the mother,[4] there is no refuge like the mother, there is no shelter like the mother, there is no beloved like the mother. Since she has carried him in her body, she is, according to the tradition, the carrier (dhātrī), since she has borne him she is the bearer (jananī), since she has nourished his limbs to greatness, she is his little mother (ambā), since she has borne a man, she is the bearer of men, since the child humbly listens to her, she is the kinswoman (çuçrū); the mother is his own body.[5] Could a man who is in his senses and whose head is

[1] So according to K., where sutasnehaiḥ stands instead of sutaṃ snehaiḥ (272).

[2] Nature of a guru, that is, dignity, or else, worth, importance (for the son).

[3] Or: If he goes to his mother, he is wont to act like a child of two years.

[4] So cooling and so faithful.

[5] Liter.: the identical, unparted body.

not hollow[1] kill *her*! The purpose which the married pair cherish when they unite their life powers is also cherished by the mother and father, so it is said; actually the case is so only with the mother.[2] The mother knows to what paternal family (gotra) he belongs, the mother knows whose he is. The mother by the mere carrying (of the fruit of her body) feels a joyful love and tenderness; for the father the children are offspring (pituḥ prajāḥ). If men at first (at the wedding) themselves carry out the entwining of hands, and enter on the state of common duty, and then go off to others, women do not deserve any blame.[3] For from supporting the wife the man is called her spouse (bhartar), and from protecting the wife her husband (or lord, pati); but where this attribute is gone, there there is no longer spouse, and no longer husband.[4] Therefore the woman does not sin, only the man sins; and if he goes astray into the great crime of

[1] K. (272.33) reads more smoothly: cetanāvān sa ko hanyād.

[2] The man in sexual union really seeks only his pleasure, but the woman seeks the child, which rule will always be true.

[3] Should they break faith, too, with the faithless men. I read vācyatām instead of yācyatāṃ. The Bomb. text would mean: then women are not fit for wooing, that is, if they are asked, then they cannot say no. K. has yāpyatāṃ, which is translated under the text by tyājyatāṃ. According to Böhtlingk Bühler for yāpya gives the rendering: to whom a rebuke is to be given. This would agree with my amendment, but I should not be able to justify it. Essentially the meaning is always the same, and we should here have a confirmation of my reading of xiii, 19 ff.: Women are what men make them, which, indeed, Forel, for example, also rightly stresses in his *Sexuelle Frage*.—With yāsyati I follow the interpretation of the schol., which fits in well with the exposition that follows. It is true that there is only there: "if men (had to) go," and Deussen in his *Vier philosoph. Texten des MBh.* gives the rendering "run away". This, indeed, fits in with the general position: Gautama has evidently neglected his wife from the beginning, and after her offence also he at once runs off again into the forest (cp. also çl. 62). But with such sermons we must not insist unbendingly on such strict logic.

[4] According to the context, this saying, which we found already in i, 104.30, means: The husband has as his duty, by his own example especially, to give in the ethical sense strength, stay, and protection to the wife, not only to feed her, and cherish and care for her.

adultery, it is only the man who sins in this.[1] The greatest thing of all for the woman, according to the tradition, is the husband, he is her highest godhead. But now she has given him her own self, that stands equal to his self, as the highest thing.[2] On women no sin is laid, only the man sins ; since in all cases it is women who have to let themselves be the object of sin, so women do not sin. And since from the woman's side no invitation [3] has gone to him to satisfy the desire for love, the wrongdoing is undoubtedly his, who clearly gave the call to it. But even the unreasoning beasts would thence know that a woman, and moreover the mother that is in highest honour, must not be killed. In the father is seen the whole assemblage of the divinities united in one person ; but in the mother, because of her love, we come to the whole assemblage of mortals and gods." [4] While in this wise he pondered deeply because of his slow doing, a long time went by him. Then his father came up, the very wise Medhātithi, that Gautama living an ascetic life, having during this time weighed the offence against the established order done by his wife. In great torment he spoke, shedding tears in his pain, filled with remorse by the helping grace of his holy knowledge, and firmness of character : " Into my hermitage came Indra, the ruler of the world, the shatterer of strongholds, giving himself out as a guest, and taking a Brahman's shape. Friendly words I spoke to him, and honoured him with a joyful welcome ; guest water and water for the feet I brought him, as is seemly. And if he is told, ' I am at thy bidding,' he will then start love-making.[5] If then something evil happened, it is not

[1] According to Manu, viii, 317 ; Vasishṭha, xix, 44, the adulteress casts off her sin onto the husband ; he should have kept her from it.

[2] The very expression ātmānaṃ dadau does not seem at all to allow of a reference to the son she has borne him.

[3] Liter. : suggestion, reference, hint. On this conception cp. Freidank's *Bescheidenheit* ed. Bezzenberger, p. 158 : Swâ wîp, etc.

[4] Probably not so well : the whole assemblage, etc., comes into the mother.

[5] Or : If a man is told : " I am at thy bidding," then he (in the world, anyhow) will show his inclination. This version is after all

the woman that has done wrong. So neither the woman, nor myself, nor the wanderer (the guest) Indra can be accused of sinning against the law.[1] But it is my want of thought that sinned. Therefore do the holy men that are wholly chaste say that from jealousy comes woe. Carried away now by jealousy, I have sunk into the sea of evil-doing. Who will bring me safely to the shore, who have slain a good woman and a wife, and one brought to lechery through evil fate,[2] and, as I should have cherished and cared for her, my 'fosterward' (my wife, bhāryā)? If Slow Doer, he with the noble soul, to whom in a weak moment I gave the order, were to-day indeed a slow doer, then he would keep me from a mortal sin (pātaka). Slow Doer, hail to thee! Hail to thee, Slow Doer! If thou to-day art a slow doer, then thou art indeed a slow doer. Save me and thy mother and the penitential merit I have acquired, and thyself from mortal sin; to-day be a slow doer. Long wast thou yearned for by thy mother, long borne in the womb; to-day let thy slow doing yield fruit, thou Slow Doer."[3] As Gautama, the great Ṛishi, thus was grieving himself, he saw his son Cirakāri standing near. But so soon as Cirakāri had seen his father, he threw the knife away, filled with deepest sorrow, and set about winning his

to be preferred, and because, too, Indra's guilt thus stands out all the sharper.

[1] I did in accordance with law, custom (and reason) when I welcomed the guest so unreservedly, and Indra was only following his own law (his nature, dharma) when he as a woman-hunter paid her court.

[2] Indra came in Gautama's shape to her, at least according to the usual version. But here it is not clear whether this is the leading motive here, indeed, Gautama's words in particular about the guest in Brahman's shape rather speak against it, so that after all "through evil passion" might be better. Of course, for this meaning of the word I can only bring forward from the MBh., xii, 290.20: avyasanitā, passionlessness. Cp. too the later note on the fact that Ahalyā knew Indra very well.

[3] K. reads Cirakārika. But the nom. too can be read ("as Slow Doer"). The following çloka to me seems to be an insertion, although K. too has it (272.58).

favour with his head. When Gautama then saw him with head sunk towards the ground, and saw his wife all mazed,[1] he was filled with the greatest joy. He clasped his son long in his arms, and in a lengthy speech praised him for his blessed procrastination ; for : "Slowly let the friend be knit to one, and slowly let go again the friend that has been won ; for the friend slowly won can be long kept. Where passion, pride, arrogance, hurtfulness, evil-doing, and anything unfriendly that is to be done (to another) are in question, then is the slow doer praised. Where the question is of trespasses not cleared up of kindred and friends, servants and wives the slow doer is praised."

In the eyes of the law, of course, and also in practice, so far as the rule was not weakened or altogether annulled through more than ordinary strength in the woman or for some other reason, the patriarchal system prevailed in India then as now, and, to the aforesaid high position of the mother, was opposed her, in many respects, lower valuation as a woman. But the Epic gives us glimpses enough to show us that in those times the woman held in general a more important position than she did later.[2] We shall speak of that below. And again, in the narrative parts themselves are to be found plenty of indications not only of that loving and pious attitude towards the two parents, but also of the attitude towards the mother in particular. When his house-priest or Purohita has given Yudhishṭhira a long lecture on the proper behaviour which the brothers must observe as servants to the prince, he that is thus preached to says : "Now we are instructed, and I beg leave to say, that none can set this forth but our mother Kuntī and the high-souled Vidura" (iv, 4.52). Together with his brothers he shows over and over again throughout the long narrative the same attitude of mind towards his mother ; and Bhīma, the man of deep feelings, by far the most human and attractive of the Pāṇḍavas,

[1] Lit. : without (fair, dignified) appearance ; cp. "to lose countenance", and "like a whipped dog". Cp. xii, 333.18 ; vii, 72.10.

[2] Or perhaps rather : that in the world of the MBh., which at least grew up out of an original Kshattriya poetry, the woman was in far higher esteem than she was when controlled by more priestly notions and conditions (or in other social classes).

ſtands out, too, through a tender regard towards Kuntī. The visit paid by the Pāṇḍavas to their old mother in the hermitage, their farewell of the aged woman, and their sorrow at learning that she has been burned in the foreſt, are likewise affectingly drawn for us (xv, 21 ff. ; 36.27, 28, 35 ff. ; 37.18 ff.). We hear, too, the note of the heart's true feeling in Yudhishṭhira's words about Kuntī's womanly virtues, motherly tenderness, and bitter lot (v, 83.37 ff.). For her is the firſt and far the moſt urgent greeting sent by him through Vidura to Hāstinapura. And so for other cases.

And towards the other wives of the father the sons show in the Epic a pious spirit like that we have already met with in Rāma. Along with other heroes Yudhishṭhira should here again be mentioned, who begs Nakula off from death and not his own brothers, when the Yaksha in the pond lets him have only one of the four dead, and who gives as the reason : " Both the wives of my father are dear alike to me ; both Mādrī and Kuntī shall have a son " (iii, 313.13).[1]

But not only the Pāṇḍavas, who are painted as Indian patterns of virtue, but even Duryodhana, set before us in the colours of the arch-villain, liſtens rather to his mother than to his father and his other kinsfolk. Kṛishṇa goes as the messenger of the five brothers to the court of Dhṛitarāshṭra to negotiate a peace. In a solemn ſtate gathering all ſtrive to talk Duryodhana into giving way and coming to terms with the sons of Pāṇḍu. But in vain. Then Kṛishṇa, who has it in his heart only to offend Duryodhana and light the fires of war, addresses biting words to the ſtubborn man, and at laſt the latter together with his followers leaves the hall, blazing with anger. Now no other means can be thought of : his mother Gāndhārī, the " far-seeing one ", is sent for, and she begins by reading her husband a fitting lesson before all the illuſtrious lords, and then she orders Duryodhana to be at once called. And though he is spitting

[1] For the tale itself cp. e.g. Jāt. No. 6 (this one is weak and secondary, patched up late from various fragments; for Yaksha's queſtions, Jāt. No. 377); Franke in WZKM, xx, 324 ff. ; Hertel, Kathāratnākara, i, 58 ff. ; Daçāvatāracaritam, viii, 533–540 ; Holtzmann, *Das Mahābhārata*, etc., ii, p. 82, 96, 246 ; my transl. of the Daçakumārac., p. 297 ; Crooke, *Popular Relig.*, etc., ii, 128.

with rage like a snake, he obediently comes there, "filled with longing for his mother's words." In a long speech she shows him how wrong he is, and points out to him that the kingdom really belongs to the Pāṇḍavas, and that he must be satisfied with the half of it, otherwise he will yet lose all through his wilfulness and blindness, and bring disaster on all. But, on the one hand, her words are not very motherly and loving in tone, on the other the self-willed, angry man is not now disposed to listen to such things; so he storms out again indignantly without speaking a word, away to his comrades.[1]

The mother of Old India, like her daughter to-day, shows herself fully worthy of this childish love. The Epic, too, offers both in the inwoven tales and in the main narrative many heart-gladdening pictures of the tender love of the mother, self-forgetting and only thinking of the child's welfare. Here only one or two features in the life of the leading heroines may be given. Kuntī, whose youthful adventure with the sun god was to bring her so much sorrow throughout her life, had also to go through much anxiety, care, and suffering for the sake of her other sons.[2] In their childhood days they, indeed, already gave her many an anxious moment. Bhīma was a very

[1] Yudhishṭhira, indeed, once also speaks harshly to his mother. But one must say she had really acted then to all appearance with unwarrantable thoughtlessness (i, 162.5–11). Then we hear from Vidura's wise lips: "These six always despise him who earlier has done good by them: disciples despise the teacher, when their instruction is ended; the sons the mother, when they have married; the lover the woman, when his love is dead; they whose business has been carried through, him that does it; he that has crossed the waste of the sea (niṣtīrṇakāntāra, cp. e.g. 'pilot of the waste' in the 2nd Jātaka), the ship; and the healed sick, the leech" (v, 33.87 f.). Of the lover the rule holds all over the world; Ward especially in his *View of the Hindus* has tried to show how thankless in general the Hindus are, but partly without sufficient warrant; and Bose, *The Hindoos as They Are*, p. 223 note, has something to say of the married son's contempt towards his mother. But it is certain that the son's love for the mother cannot be denied of the Indian, and really unique evidence of it is given in Samayamātṛikā, iv, 44–65 (pp. 44–46 in my translation).

[2] "It is decreed of mothers that their birth pangs shall not cease until they die." John Galsworthy, *The Country House*, p. 236.

high-spirited lad, and as he had the strength of a giant, not only did he surpass his cousins and play-fellows in all trials of strength and skill, but he picked them out to be the victims, too, of the wildest pranks. "By the hair did the strong one catch hold of them, pulled them headlong down, and dragged them screaming along the ground, barking their knees, heads, and shoulders. When playing in the water he clasped ten boys (at once), took a long dive with them under the water, and only let them go when they were half-dead. When they climbed trees to look for fruit, Bhīma would make the trees quiver by kicking them. Then the trees would shake to and fro under the wild force of his blows, and the frightened boys would soon fall down, together with the fruit" (i, 128.19 ff.). In this wise he found he had no friends at all, and Duryodhana especially pursued him with a bitter hatred. This cousin now one day had splendid "houses of cloths and rugs" made by the Ganges, and furnished with choicest food and heady drinks. There the princes then made merry, and threw cakes into one another's mouths. Duryodhana kept this game up with Bhīma a long time with great spirit, for Bhīma, the "wolf's belly" (Vṛikodara), was a mighty eater. But he put poison withal into the cakes, and while Bhīma lay fast asleep, wearied with many athletic exercises, and overcome with drunkenness, Duryodhana had him bound and thrown into the Ganges without his brothers knowing anything about it. When they wanted to go home, they could not find him, and the good mother was now in mortal anguish, when they came back without him; for she knew his cousin's hatred and cruelty (i, 118 f.).—But they all grew up to be strong and skilful youths, and at the festal exhibition, where the accomplished sons of Pāṇḍu and of Dhṛitarāshṭra gave a show of their skill, Kuntī sat glad and proud among the women onlookers. When now Arjuna so greatly distinguished himself and was greeted with a storm of shouts by the onlookers, then did Kuntī's bosom grow wet with the flood of her tears of joy (i, 135.13).[1] But short was the time her delight lasted, as we

[1] Her milk also flows from her, as it so often does from the Indian mother, even the elderly one, at the sight of her child (e.g. i, 105.26; 135.13; iii, 226.24; vii, 78.16; ix, 44.12. In K, i, 310.13 even from a woman that has never brought forth).

have seen : Karṇa came onto the stage, the son of her maidenhood, and the embittered opponent of Arjuna, and challenged him to fight. Swooning, the mother of them both sank to the ground (i, 136.27 ff.). Together with her sons she was to be burned in the house of resin but escaped with them, and now shared their wanderings filled with danger and hardship [1] ; her splendid children, from whom she had hoped so much, were fugitives and beggars, and with them she lived on alms. Arjuna's skill with the bow now won the princess Draupadī, and in spite of the strong opposition of the disillusioned rivals they brought home this fair prize of victory. The mother knew nothing of all this, and hovered in the darkness of anguish lest the hostile men or evil spirits had slain the sons who did not come back in the evening at the proper time (i, 190.43 ff.). The evil game of dice followed, and the thirteen years' banishment of her children. Filled with the sorrow of despair, she bade them farewell, and showed herself especially anxious on behalf of Sahadeva, the son of her fellow-wife Mādrī—a complement to the love which the sons in the Epic are wont to give the fellow-wives of their mother.[2] But not one word of reproach against Yudh., who has brought about all the wretchedness, escapes from her lips here ; it is only her own, her deserved fate that she makes responsible — a true Indian mother (ii, 79.10 ff.). In the end the great fight blazed up which brought her the long wished for triumph of her reviled sons, but along with it sorrow abounding beyond words, and so finally, as an old woman with her blind brother-in-law and his wife, she went off into the penitential forest—a much-tried, much-loving mother, but no weak or faint-hearted one, as we shall yet see. Characteristic, too, is Draupadī's behaviour (ii, 71.26 ff.). She has been gambled away by Yudhishṭhira, and has fallen into slavery and shameful ill-treatment, and Dhṛitarāshṭra

[1] The episode of the burning of the house of resin is imitated, altered, and further elaborated in the Jain tale in my *Hindu Tales*, p. 21 ff.

[2] Passages which there show how attached she is to Sahadeva, and he to her, are : ii, 79.8, 28 ; 19.32 ff. ; v, 90.35–42 (here including Nakula, Mādrī's other son) ; xv, 16.10 ; 26.9 ff. ; xv, 24. espec. 8 ff. ; 36.36 ; 39.18.

now offers her a favour. She says : " Yudhishṭhira must be free, that my son may not be called a slave's son." [1] The unmotherly disposition shown by Gāndhārī towards her son, which comes out especially in her sermon to Dhṛitarāshṭra, ii, 75, stands alone, and has been put in her mouth by a calculated partisan distortion.

[1] The Indian mother listens with greedy ears to the predictions uttered of her little son by the wise Brahmans, and hopes for their fulfilment later, even when he seems to show no promise whatever (v, 134.8, 9). And even of Kuntī we read at that test of her sons in doctrine : " But since K. in the master of the Aṅgas (in Karṇa) had recognized her son, betrayed by his divine marks, a secret joy glowed in her " (i, 137.23). A woman has truly lived when she with her husband has practised the duties of religion, has enjoyed companionship with him, and has had children from him (i, 158.33). Parents and daughter are saddened beyond measure in this tale, because the father must be the food of the Rākshasa. Then the little son runs up to all these as they weep, tries to comfort them, takes a hay-straw, and shouts : " I will kill the monster with it ! " And joy shines into the darkness of their souls (i, 159.20 f.).

VI

Woman in her Sexual Relations

WHILE woman in the Indian view is above all destined for motherhood, yet this cannot be brought about without man, and woman in her sexual relations, therefore, makes up an important chapter. Furthermore, there is the fact that love and the life of love presents in itself a subject which is ever new, ever inexhaustible, ever filled with enchantment; and poetry, moreover, has in more senses than one its vital nerve therein. The Epic, too, yields many contributions to this theme: tales, sayings, details. But in agreement with the stricter, relatively pure and moral outlook governing the Epic poetry, we are not to seek here any variegated collection of love and even lecherous adventures, allusions, and so forth. Dramas and short plays of adultery, or merry cuckold tales are not found in the fare here set before us; and the loose relations, too, between maidens and men, which are in many other lands so much a matter of course, and not a rare thing in the later Indian literature, are quite foreign to the Epic, for all that even Vyāsa, the so-called author of the Mahābh., and playing no unimportant a part in it, and the hero Karṇa, unsurpassed in Indian literature, are sons of unmarried women. We saw, indeed, how they owed their life only to the whim of their fathers, and not to the loving choice of their mothers. True indeed that also the Epic has in it very many tales and references that in the Western world would be branded as improper. But in this a great injustice is done them. Such things are almost always brought forward in all scientific seriousness, and quite simply as a matter of fact, as though we were in an anatomical lecture-room. The Indian, the old Italian novelist, a French poet of Troubadour times, and, for instance, a Brantôme can apparently tell us something more or less of the same kind, but *si duo faciunt, idem non est idem.* Brantôme grunts in his slush like five hundred erotomaniac swine; the fabliau poet

treats us, indeed, to the naſtieſt filth, sometimes with finesse, but often to our taſte unspeakably gross ; from the Italian's face there not seldom looks out what is rather a very naughty, but almoſt innocent child of nature—one might almoſt say urchin—and this along with even a fully ripened mind and ſtyle. How the Old Indian, however, describes such things, at leaſt usually, is seen, we hope, clearly enough in this book. Love tales of the usual, and above all European kind are, therefore, not to be found in the Epic. Love and wedlock here cannot be separated.[1] The Trojan War came about through a flighty wife choosing to let herself be seduced—the struggle between the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas, the subject of the Mahābh. proper, breaks forth, as we are assured several times in the poem, because the slight cannot be forgotten which has been caſt on a noble lady, though this can only be looked on as " the ſtraw that breaks the camel's back ", and in the Rāmāyaṇa all that is really dealt with is the chaſtising of the insolent robber of the chaſte Sītā, and the setting free of this great lady. The world's literature has no more lovely songs of the faithful wife's love for her husband than the poem of Damayantī and that of Sāvitrī. Both are found in the Mahābh., and they are not the only ones to treat of this subject. The heroine, moreover, of the Rāmāyaṇa has for thousands of years in India been shining forth as a picture of moſt spotless womanhood.

" When women become ripe for love "—this for the Indian is no romance, but a practical chapter in the physiology of sex.

[1] Love for one's wife is impossible ; this is what the basic principle, as we well know, of the old French polite world tells us ; and to-day love between husband and wife is ſtill almoſt always scorned, particularly by works of romance, as a subject for treatment. But times out of count on the other hand we find in Old Indian books, juſt as in the Epic : It is on the wife that the attainment of the three great goals of life depends—religious merit, worldly gain, and kāma (enjoyment, love) : and Mārkaṇḍeyapur., xxi, 74 lays down the principle : " Without a wife no love." The man of the world in India—and often enough he has his say in Hindu literature—will, it is true, add in brackets as an explanation not only : itarasya, the other man's, that is to say, the wife or the future wife, as with us, but besides this the main object of Indian eroticism—the harlot.

This, the most important part of the woman's life, makes its appearance with the ṛitu ; with the ṛitu love begins, with it it ends, in it it has always its central point. Ṛitu denotes the monthly cleansing, and then in particular those days after the period, from the fourth day onwards,[1] which in the Indian view are proper for conception. In what follows I shall use the Sanskrit word only in the second and narrower meaning. The setting in of the menses brings with it not only the capacity for the full sexual life, and the right thereto, but first and foremost the divine call to it, the unavoidable duty. A menstruating girl in a father's house is a heavy sin for him ; the daughter is now dedicated to the divinities of married state. The legal provision, therefore, already touched upon often makes its appearance, namely that the father shall marry his daughter off before the beginning of this time, and then, so soon as she is sexually ripe, the husband fetches her home.[2] As already

[1] The first twelve, or according to other statements, the first sixteen nights after menstruation begins, excluding the three (or four) first nights. Also the eleventh (and the thirteenth) and certain moon-days are often put under a ban. Cp. Manu, iii, 45–50 ; iv, 128 ; Jolly, "Medizin" (in Bühler's *Grundriss*), p. 50 ; Winternitz, *Die Frau i. d. ind. Religionen*, p. 32 [6]. See further below.

[2] Pradānaṃ prāg ṛitoḥ "the girl must be married before the coming of menstruation". Gautama, xviii, 21 ; so also Vishṇu, xxiv, 41 ; and in 23 Gaut. gives as the opinion of others : "before she wears clothes." This view is also in Vasishṭha, xvii, 70 ; Baudh., iv, 1.11. Cp. Manu, ix, 88 f. The point stressed by the law books is the fear lest otherwise the ṛitu of the young woman be left unused. As a matter of fact child marriage is really based not so much on religious grounds, as on economic : on the heavy competition in the marriage market. The father must find his daughter a good husband, and dare not wait long. This Risley has penetratingly and understandingly shown in *Caste in Relation to Marriage* (quoted in Billington, *Woman in India*, p. 59 ff.). Love comes, too, according to him, in marriage. Indeed, it comes perhaps the more surely just because a very early marriage may keep the girl from falling in love elsewhere, and perhaps very foolishly. Anyhow the thing is one that commends itself because of this fear too, to those in authority over the girl. Cp. Daçakumāracar., p. 285, line 27 ff. of my translation. Indeed, the fear that the daughter may one day bring shame on the family

mentioned, child marriage has no place in the narrative parts of the Epic.[1] The heroines of the main story and of the inserted episodes are already grown up on their marriage, just like the love heroines of the ordinary Indian narrative literature (cp. Leumann, *Die Nonne*, strophe 122 ff.; Meyer, Kauṭilya, addit., 246.14). But the Epic also stresses the point that that time, the ṛitu, must not slip by without being made use of. For the woman is there that she may bring forth, and her calling must not be barred to her or made harder. Therefore, during each ṛitu not only has she the urge to coition, but for her this is then also a holy right and command.

It is often emphatically laid down that the husband during the ṛitu must visit (ṛitugamana) the wife, and it is a sin for him not to fulfil his married duty then. In Rām., ii, 75 in a long imprecatory formula, a very great number of the worst sins and atrocities is set forth, and in çl. 52 is mentioned the evil-minded man (dushṭātman) who does not let his wife have her rights, when she has bathed after the monthly cleansing. In MBh., vii, 17.28–36 we likewise find a list of especially horrible

through love entanglements is even given as a main reason for the killing of girls among the old Arabs (*Anthropos*, iii, p. 62 ff. Perhaps a misunderstanding? Cp. Welhausen, *Gött. Nachr.* (1893), p. 458). Dubois ed. Beauchamp[3], p. 207, even states that Indian maidens could not be entrusted with their own honour up to their marriageable years, since they would not be able to resist temptation. "Therefore measures cannot be taken too early to place them intact in their husband's hands." On the other hand he himself declares on p. 314 that "Hindu women are naturally chaste"; and on p. 354 he remarks that they are chaster than the women of many lands possessing a higher culture.

[1] Bhandarkar in ZDMG, Bd. 47, "History of Child Marriage," has very skilfully defended the statement that "in the time of Āçvalāyana and many other authors of Grihyasūtras marriages after puberty were a matter of course" (p. 153). Mahānirvāṇatantra, viii, 107, seems to be opposed to the marrying of the daughter before she has reached ripeness of understanding; and Nārada, who in matters of women otherwise shows a remarkably open mind, says she must be given away when the monthly flow has shown itself (pravṛitte rajasi); but what goes before teaches that then this is to be at once (xii, 24–27).

sins, punished with torments in the other world, and among them we find the neglect to approach the wife at the ṛitu times.[1] On the contrary, it is highly virtuous to practise love on those days with the wife. Subhadrā in vii, 78 bewails her son fallen in the tender bloom of youth, Abhimanyu, and for him wishes in a long drawn out prayer of blessing that he may in the world beyond enjoy the happiness to be won through the noblest, best, and most pious human deeds and thoughts. And here she brings this in, too : " Thine be the lot of those that are obedient to father and mother, and of those that only find their delight with their own wife ; and mayest thou hasten towards the lot of the wise men who at the time of the ṛitu go to their wife and keep from strange women " (çl. 31, 32). In the same way in xii, 110.9 : " They who do as is fitting with their own wife at each ṛitu, and faithfully carry out the sacrifice by fire, overcome disasters." Cohabitation in the ṛitu is one of the virtues leading to heaven (xiii, 144.13–14), and also one of the things whereby a Çūdra obtains the being born again as a Brahman (although not without intermediate stages, xiii, 143.29 ff.). But on the other hand it is then found to be an ethical command that the husband keep not only from all other women, but from his own wife, too, outside the ṛitu or ṛitukāla (time of the ṛitu). He that obeys this law practises chastity, is equal in virtue to him that wholly abstains. So, for instance, in xiii, 162.41,42. Cp. iii, 208.15 ; 207.33 ; xiii, 157.9 ff. ; xii, 193.11. Chastity has two forms : monasticism, and copulation in the ṛitu only (Rām., i, 9.5, and comment.). " How does one become a brahmacārin (sexual ascetic) ? " Yudhishṭhira asks Bhīshma, and the answer is : " Let a man go to his own wife during the ṛitu " (xii, 221.11). In xii, 243, the holy duties of the father of the family are enumerated, and there in çl. 7 we find : " Let him call his wife only at the time of the ṛitu (nānṛitau)." In xiii, 93.124, copulation outside the ṛitu is set beside killing a cow and relieving the body into water, and in 94.27 it stands along with the denial of the divine

[1] Whoso does not know his wife carnally during the ṛitu must suffer the pains of hell. Mārk.-Pur., xiv, 1 ff. ; Garuḍapurāṇasārod., iv, 40 ; Parāçara, iv, 12 f. (the wife that forgets her duty goes to hell, the husband who does so becomes an embryo-slayer), etc.

revelation of the Veda. The ethical standpoint is given, for instance, by the fine saying in xii, 110.23 : " He who eats only to maintain life, who copulates only to beget offspring, who speaks only to utter the truth—he escapes vexations." [1]

Sexual union not from the fire of love, but only during the ṛitu is the old and holy rule for all the four castes, too, which prevailed in the golden age ; and great was the blessing. Thus, i, 64.4 ff. tells us : When Paraçurāma had destroyed all the Kshattriyas in the world, the Kshattriya women to get children approached the Brahmans. With them the pious Brahmans united at every ṛitu, but not from greed of love, nor at any other time. The Kshattriya women now bore offspring strong and long-lived beyond the ordinary, and all creatures ever kept to the pious rule of rightful copulation, even the beasts. So, then, they went to their wives during the ṛitu only, then they throve through their virtuous ways and lived a hundred thousand years. From all pain, of mind and body, mankind was freed ; none died in childhood ; none that had not reached the bloom of youth knew woman (na ca striyaṃ prajānāti kaçcid aprāptayauvanaḥ, çl. 17). They practised all that was fair, good, and pious ; the kings ruled with justice ; and so it rained at the right time and in the right place, and everywhere prevailed nothing but happiness, and strength and peace—it was the golden age. Such glory as this was naturally in the first place due to the most excelling begetters of this race, the Brahmans, but then, too, to their way of begetting virtuous, strong, and beautiful offspring. At this time the woman is not only well fitted and with the right and duty to procreate, but also she is clean. Otherwise uncleanness dwells in her, and every kind of magical harm,[2] and in the peculiarly mysterious menstrual blood are concentrated all these dread powers, but in it, too, they are discharged. Therefore, the Epic declares, too : " This according to the law is an incomparable means of cleansing the woman, O Dushyanta ; for month after month the menstrual

[1] For the sake of offspring was the coitus made. K. i, 107.21.

[2] This belief, spread over the whole earth, has its place, too, in the Old Indian marriage-songs, and in the wedding ritual (Çāṅkhy.-Grihy., i, 16, 2 ff.; 18, 2 ff.; Pārask., i, 11 ; Hiraṇy., i, 6, 20.2 ; 7, 24).

blood takes all the evil in them away" (duritāni in the magical and in the moral meaning, K., i, 100.5). Indeed, even if the man suspects his wife of unfaithfulness, he must confidently lie with her again after she has had her courses, since she is thereby cleansed again, like a vessel by ashes (xii, 35.30).[1] So, therefore, the woman can for this reason, too, demand her natural and religious rights during the ṛitu.

And she wills to have them: "As the fire at the time of the sacrifice by fire awaits its time (the time when the offering shall be brought it), so the woman awaits in the time of the ṛitu the ṛitu embrace" (xiii, 162.41). Ṛituṃ dehi, the menstruating woman says to the husband, "give me the ṛitu right, the ṛitu embrace, make that my ṛitu may not be in vain." So it is in the following tale. As we have seen, the energetic daughter of a Brahman, Devayānī, made the king Yayāti her husband. Her father straitly enjoined on him not to touch her friend and slave-girl, the king's daughter Çarmishṭhā. Çarmishṭhā saw that the time of her ripeness was come, and she thought of her period. "The time of the ṛitu is come, and I have chosen no husband. What is fitting now, what is to be done now? What am I to do that the matter may be truly done? Devayānī has borne, but I am become ripe to no end. As she chose her husband, so will I choose him. The king must grant me the fruit of a son; that is my fast resolve. And now at this very time perhaps he of the just heart will secretly come before my eyes." And about this time the king happened to go forth, and tarried near the açoka-wood (where the fair one was dwelling), and gazed at Çarmishṭhā. When the sweet-smiling Çarmishṭhā secretly saw him thus alone, she went up to him, folded her hands before her forehead, and spoke the words unto the king: "Who can visit a woman in the house of Soma, Indra, Vishṇu, Yama, and Varuṇa, or in thine, O son of Nahusha? Thou knowest that I am ever gifted with beauty, nobility, and good character. I pray thee, as I ask thy favour of thee: Give me the ṛitu, O highest herdsman of men!" Yayāti spoke: "I know thee to be perfected in good character,

[1] The parallels will be given later. We even encounter a belief that intercourse with the adulteress is magically dangerous to her husband. Hartland, *Prim. Patern.*, ii, 122.

thou faultless daughter of the Daitya. And in thy form I cannot see a needle's point of anything that were to blame. But Uçanas, the Kāvya, said, when I brought Devayānī home : 'This daughter of Vṛishaparvan shalt thou not call onto thy bed.'" Çarmishṭhā spoke : "An untrue word spoken in jeſt, or among women, or at a wedding, or when in danger of life, or where all a man's belongings are to be taken from him, does no hurt. These five lies, it is said, are not grave sins (pātakāni)." Yayāti spoke : "The king is the law of life for beings ; he falls to deſtruction, when he utters untruth ; even though earthly ill [1] befall me, I cannot act falsely." Çarmishṭhā spoke : "These two are held to be identical : one's own husband, and the husband of the woman friend. Marriage, it is said, is the same for both (one and the same, common, sama). Thee, as the husband of my friend, I have chosen." Yayāti spoke : "To him that asks muſt be given, this rule of life I have taken for mine.[2] And thou art asking me for the fulfilment of a wish. Speak, what can I do for thee ?" Çarmishṭhā spoke : "Keep me from a wrong, O king, and let me share in the law [3] ; granted offspring by thee, let me practise in the world the higheſt holy law. Three there are, O king, that cannot own anything : the wife, the slave, and the child ; that which they acquire is the property of him who owns them.[4] I am the slave of Devayānī, and she is in thy power : I and she belong to thee for thy pleasure ; enjoy me, O king." Thus addressed, the king acknowledged this, and said : "True it is" ; he honoured Çarmishṭhā, and let her share in the holy law. She then bore him a lotus-eyed boy like a child of the gods, and then two more besides. But Devayānī found out these deeds of pious devotion,[5] and at firſt bitterly reproached Çarmishṭhā. But

[1] Arthakṛicchra. [2] As a Kshattriya.

[3] Or : set me on the path of the law (the fulfilment of the law, virtue). In K. (76.30 ff.) she furthermore explains that he who gives clothing, money, cows, land, etc., gives something external ; it is a serious thing to give oneself, one's body, that is, to beget a child for a woman.

[4] Cp. e.g. Manu, viii, 416 ; Nārada, v, 41.

[5] Devayānī once went for a ſtroll with the king. Then she saw the three little boys playing, and said in aſtonishment : "Whose children

she made answer : " I have acted in accordance with law and virtue, and therefore I fear thee not. When thou didst choose thy husband, I, too, chose him. For the husband, according to the law, becomes the friend's husband. Thou art for me worthy of honour and respect, thou art the first wife and the Brahman lady, but for me still worthier of honour is the kingly Ṛishi ; how dost thou not know that ? " With weeping eyes and angry soul Devayānī now hastened off to her father, and complained to him that right had been overcome by wrong, for Çarmishṭhā had outdone her and humiliated her : with Çarmishṭhā Yayāti had begotten three sons, and with her herself only two.[1] The king, who had hastily followed her, made excuses : " Because she asked me for the ṛitu, O holy man, and from no other reason did I do this rightful service to the daughter of the Dānava prince. If a woman asks for the ṛitu, and a man does not give her the ṛitu, then by them that know the holy writings he is declared to be an embryo-slayer. And he who, having been secretly asked, does not approach a woman that is seized with desire and is meet for union, is, in the laws, called by the wise a slayer of the fruit of the body. These considerations I had before me, and, moved by fear of doing a wrong, I went to Çarmishṭhā." But with the angry father, deeply devoted to his daughter, these considerations availed not (i, 82, 83).

At such times the woman will even lure an unhappy disciple into the awful crime of adultery with the teacher's wife. The prose tale in i, 3.42 ff. tells us as follows : The Ṛishi Dhaumya had to be away from home for a long time, and entrusted his

are those ? They look so like thee." She asked the boys themselves, and they pointed with their fingers to Yayāti as their father, and said Çarmishṭhā was their mother. They all ran up to their begetter ; but he " did not in the presence of his wife welcome them at all joyfully ", but was " as it were filled with shame ", and the poor repulsed little boys ran screaming to their mother.

[1] This outdoing in child-bearing, and the sorrow and rage of the woman thus injured reminds us of Kuntī and Mādrī and of 1 Moses, chap. 30, v, 1–23 (that here the children of the concubine or of the secondary wife are looked on as the children of the lawful wife has not only Indian but also other Eastern parallels).

disciple Uttanka with the care of the house ; he was to see to it that no harm came. While he was dwelling there, all the wives of the teacher together called him and spoke : "The teacher's wife has the ṛitu, and the teacher is away. Do thou so act that her ṛitu be not fruitless ; she is in despair." Thus addressed, he made answer : "I must not at the urging of women do this monstrous deed. For the teacher did not enjoin on me : 'Even a monstrous deed shalt thou do.'" When the teacher then came home again, and learned from him what had happened, he rewarded him most magnificently, but the woman took her revenge by and by, when she found the opportunity.

King Uparicara was more thoughtful and kindlier to women than this holy man and his disciple, for he sent off the longed for fluid to his beloved wife at this critical time by bird post. At the bidding of his forefathers, he had to go off to hunt, just when his wife was ready for impregnation (ṛitusnātā).[1] Now he was roving the forest, obedient to the call of his forefathers, but his thoughts were away at home with Girikā, his young beloved one, who was surpassingly lovely, like unto another Lakshmī. Spring had made its entry, and the trees were glorious with the splendour of their flowers and their weight of fruit ; the kokilas sang their sweetest, and, all around, the honey-drunken

[1] The reason would be the same as in Mārk.-Pur., cxx, 6 : King Khaninetra, who has no son, goes hunting to get flesh to offer his forefathers, and through this sacrifice a son. Cp. Caland, *Ahnenkult*, p. 172. The flesh of various kinds of game and tame beasts is used for an offering to the dead, and nourishes them for far longer than many other foods, as is carefully reckoned up for each kind of flesh in the Smṛiti and in the Purāṇas, and elsewhere, I think ; and as, according to a widespread belief, children are only the dead appearing again, especially kindred and forbears, or else the shades send or bestow the children, we cannot but hold the Indian belief to be quite natural, that the Çrāddha give their help towards getting offspring. See, for example, Albrecht Dietrich, "Mutter Erde," *Arch. f. Religionswiss.*, vii, 19 ff., 39–43 ; Hartland, *Prim. Pat.*, i, 199 ff. ; Crooke, *Pop. Rel.*, i, 179 ; Krauss, *Sitte u. Brauch d. Südslawen*, 542 ; *Anthropos*, vii, 99 ; 658 ; iv, 710 ; v, 765 ; *Zschr. f. Ethnol.*, Bd. 6, p. 363 ; Gobhila, Gṛihyas., iv, 3.27 ; Caland, *Ahnenkult*, 8 ; 10 ; 13 ; 43 ; 73, n. 3 ; 10, n. 2 ; *Totenverehrung*, 6, 39, etc.

bees were humming. By love his soul was held, but he could not see Girikā. As he went along thus tortured with longing, he happened to behold a delightful açoka-tree ; the tips of its boughs were strewn with flowers, young shoots adorned it, and it was covered with clustering blossoms, honey-sweet was the smell of it, and it charmed by the scent of its flowers. Under this tree the prince of men sat himself down, taking his ease in the shade. But inspired by the wind, he gave himself up to the joyful lust after darkness' deed (sexual union). Then his seed spurted forth, as he tarried in the thick forest. And as soon as the seed had spurted out, the lord of the earth put it on the leaf of a tree, thinking with himself : " My seed shall not fall fruitlessly." " This seed of mine shall not have spurted forth to no end," that was his thought. " And may my wife's ṛitu not be lost," this was the thought of the ruler. As now the prince thus pondered and weighed, and as the best of kings recognized the fruitfulness of the seed, and reflected that it was the right time to send it to his wife, therefore he now uttered a spell over it with holy words, went to a swift-flying falcon that was standing afar off, and said to him, who knew the delicate essence of religious duty and of worldly advantage : " My friend, carry thou this seed into my house. Hand it over speedily to Girikā ; for now is the very time of her ṛitu." The falcon, the impetuous one, took it, flew swiftly up, hastened away with his utmost speed of flight ; thus did the air-wanderer. Then another falcon saw this falcon coming, who at once, when he saw him, swooped down on him, for he thought he was carrying a piece of flesh. Then the two started to fight in the air with their beaks. As they fought, the seed fell down into the waters of the Yamunā. And lo ! in it was living an Apsaras in the shape of a she-fish by Brahma's curse, who swallowed the seed. In the tenth month after this had happened the fish was caught and cut open. They found in its body a boy and a girl. The girl became the famed Satyavatī, at first afflicted by a fishy smell, whom then the king, her father, handed over to a fisherman, and who, while she was working the ferry for him, gave the gift of life to Vyāsa. The boy, her brother, as King Matsya (" Fish "), prince of the Fish-folk (Matsya), won himself a name (i, 63.36 ff.).

But sexual intercourse with the still unclean woman is strictly forbidden. To have connection with a woman during the monthly flow is reckoned among the dreadful crimes set forth in Arjuna's formula of self-cursing (xii, 73.42). To visit a rajasvalā (menstruating woman) is one of the seven things whereby a man forfeits his happiness or long life (xiii, 104.150 ; xvi, 8. 5, 6), and Brahmans who thus fall appear as sinners (pāpakarmin) in xii, 165.26. Cp. e.g. also xiii, 157.9 ff. The Apsarases by Brahma's order had to take on themselves a fourth part of the murder of a Brahman, which weighed so heavily on Indra. They besought the father of the worlds to think out some means to free them from it. He answered : " He that has connection with menstruating women, on to him will it (the Brahman-murder) immediately be transferred. Let your souls' torment forsake you ! " (xii, 282.43 ff.). He that goes to a woman that must not be visited (agamyā) shall, as a penance, for six months wear a wet garment and sleep on ashes (xii, 35.35). The agamyā are of very different kinds, but among them is the rajasvalā.[1] Cp. vii, 73.38 ff. ; Manu, xi, 171–179. The mere presence of the woman with such a stain is noxious. What she looks at the gods will not take in sacrifice (xiii, 127.13). She must not be in the neighbourhood of the ancestral offering (xiii, 92.15 ; K, xiii, 238.18), otherwise the forefathers will be unappeased even for thirteen years (xiii, 127.13, 14). For the Brahman only that food is clean on which the eyes of a menstruating woman have not fallen (xiii, 104.40 and Nīl.). Food thus spoiled is the very portion of the demons (xiii, 23.4). What the rajasvalā has prepared must not be enjoyed (xiii, 104.90 and comment.). It is even forbidden to speak with her (xiii, 104.53).[2] See also

[1] The agamyā reckoned in the law books come, indeed, mostly under the conception of incest or the staining of the teacher's marriage-bed. See, for instance, Baudh., ii, 2, 4.11 ; Nārada, xii, 73 ff.

[2] The uncleanness and danger ascribed by various peoples to the menstruating woman and her discharge is indeed well known. It strikes us then as remarkable that the Aino are not frightened by any such superstition (*Anthropos*, v, 774). According to a Red Indian tale published by Boas, *Zschr. f. Ethnol.*, xxiii, p. 552 (" Abhandlungen "), if some menstrual blood is put among the tobacco, then three puffs

iii, 221.27 ; MBh. K., xiv, 116.19 f. ; 109.22 ; 112.46 ; xiii, 161.118 ; Negelein, *Traumschlüssel der Jagaddeva*, p. 375.

from his pipe are sufficient to cause a man to fall down dead. Cp. Ploss-Bartels [4], i, 323 ff. Even the glance of the woman is at this time full of deadly poison (Hertz, "Die Sage vom Giftmädchen," *Abh. d. Münchner Ak.*, xx, 109). Cp. Thurston, *Omens*, etc., pp. 185–6. And this superstition is by no means confined to the uneducated even in our own days. Only a few years ago, I am informed by one present, the following happened in an English boarding-school for "young ladies": The cook had her courses, and therefore did not dare to touch the meat, as it would thus be spoiled. In her difficulty she called in the head mistress. But, as it happened, she too was indisposed. She called one or two of the teachers. But a spiteful fate willed it that they, too, at that very time had to pay their debt to woman's nature. The meat, therefore, could not be cut up and made ready, to the greatest joy of the very avaricious head of this hungry institution; and the butcher had to be told to take his meat back again for once.

In the Indian law writings, too, the precept is found that a menstruating woman must not be approached ; and whoever so offends must, according to Yājñav., iii, 288 fast and eat *ghī* for three days. The woman must not inflict her presence on others at this time; detailed rules for her behaviour are given, e.g. in Vasishṭha, v, 9.5 ff. ; cp. Parāçara, vii, 9–18. She was kept away from the ancestral sacrifice (Mārk.-Pur., xxxii, 25) ; her very glance makes unclean (ibid., l, 47 ; Dubois-Beauchamp, 347, cp. 708–10) ; even speaking to her sullies (Āpast., i, 3, 9.13), and food she has touched must not be eaten (Vasishṭha, v, 7 ; Yājñav., i, 168 ; Manu, iv, 208 ; Vishṇu, li, 16 ; etc.). If she wilfully touches a twice-born man, she shall be flogged with a whip (Vishṇu, v, 105). It should be said that Bṛihaspati tells us that the women "in the north" have sexual intercourse during their period (ii, 30), but this, at any rate, is probably not Aryan India. That the monthly issue is a mark of sin, but also a setting free from ill, that it is, indeed, a third or fourth part of the murder of a Brahman, is often asserted with the legend belonging thereto. So Vasishṭha, v, 4 ff. ; and here the following account according to Taitt.-Saṃh., ii, 5, 1.2–5 is given : Indra, tortured by the murder of a Brahman, unloaded a third of his guilt onto women, but for this he had to grant them the grace that they should get children from their husbands during the ṛitu. On the other hand in accord with a true Indian view we are told as follows in Bhāgavatapur., vi, 9.9 : For the boon of constant enjoyment of love (or : to be allowed to live after

their own desires? çaçvatkāmavareṇa) women took on themselves a quarter of the sin; this is seen in them month after month in the form of the menstrual blood. But the woman in this wise is fully rid of the sins she has herself done, particularly those of sex, as has been already established from the MBh. (p. 219). With this the law literature and the Purāṇa literature is in agreement. The monthly flow cleanses her from married unfaithfulness (vyabhicāra), Yājñav., i, 72; Agnipur., clxv, 6 f. (where we must read na tyajed); 19 ff.; from pollution in thought, Manu, v, 108; Vishṇu, xxii, 91; cp. Parāçara, vii, 2; x, 12. Baudhāyana, ii, 2, 4.4 teaches that women have an incomparable means of cleansing, they are never wholly stained; for month after month their sin is carried away. Exactly the same in Vasishṭha, xxviii, 4, and essentially the same in v, 4; iii, 58. Hence, then, comes the ordinance in Parāçara, x, 16–19: The woman who does wrong with a Caṇḍāla (pariah) must confess her guilt before a gathering of ten Brahmans, then fast a day and night plunged up to the neck in a well with cow-dung, water, and mud, then shave her head quite bald, and live outside the house practising further mortifications and cleansing acts, up to the time of her period; then she is clean, but must furthermore give food to Brahmans, and bestow a pair of oxen. According to 20, however, she is absolved through the Cāndrāyaṇa vow. Vasishṭha, xxviii, 1 ff. even declares: The woman even through a lover becomes no more unclean than water through urine and dung, than fire through rubbish it destroys; no matter how bad she may be, or what adventures she may have experienced, let her husband wait till she gets her courses; through these she then becomes spotless again. Before this, as a maid, she has already belonged to Soma, Gandharva, and the fire god, to them that hallow, and cannot after that be polluted by the fact of going from hand to hand—a conception to be discussed in another connection. According to Parāçara, x, 20, woman is like the earth, and can never become wholly unclean. Women, water, and pearls are never spoiled, as we have already been told. Cp. Muir, *Metrical Translations*, p. 277 f. Her mouth, that is, her kiss, is always clean, happen what may (Manu, v, 130; Yājñav., i, 187; Vishṇu, xxiii, 49; etc.), and she herself during the pleasures of love (Vasishṭha, xxviii, 8; Baudh., i, 5, 9.2). Parāçara, viii, 34, declares that a woman, a child, and an old man are never unclean. Çrī, the goddess of happiness, abides, indeed, in the body of wedded and unwedded women (Vishṇu, xcix, 8 ff.). A marriageable woman who is not actually having her period is the godlike draught of immortality (Vasishṭha, v, 1). Indeed, Vasishṭha, xxviii, 9, proclaims: Woman is pure in all her limbs, while the cow is pure only behind (cp. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, 146). Then there are

views which also give other reasons for this monthly *purgatorium terreſtre et naturale* of woman, which is generally looked on as so uncanny and fraught with evil. Mārkaṇḍeyapur., xlix, 8 ff., relates: In the beginning, women knew nothing of this contrivance of nature, but in spite of copulation they got no children. Later the passion of love (rāga) came into the world, and then, with it, both the woman's period, and offspring through the sexual union; for till then propagation had only been by means of concentrated thought (dhyānena manasā), and that very sparingly (11; cp. this book, p. 370). Cp. the already mentioned passage in Vasishṭha, v, 4 ff., and its source. As is clear enough from the puberty cuſtoms, savages, too, know that the monthly flow is needful for impregnation. See further *Anthropos*, v, p. 772 f.; vi, 703. The American Indians quoted in the laſt-named reference share moreover the belief that this flow is firſt called forth through sexual intercourse. It would thus be the holy duty of the girl to indulge in love in good time. It is no wonder that evil spirits, then, diſturb and deſtroy this blessed monthly act. See, for inſtance, Mārk.-Pur., li, 42 ff.; 114 ff. Cp. also Winternitz, *Altind. Hochzeitsrituell*, pp. 92–95.

VII

The Pleasures of Sex (surata)

ON the fourth day, however, the woman becomes snātā, ṛitusnātā (one that has bathed), and thereby peculiarly fitted for the delights of love, the surata. The woman stands in very great need of them; without them she pines: asambhogo jarā strīnāṃ (want of sexual enjoyment is decay and old age for women, iv, 39.78b–79a; v, 39.78, 79).[1] In the Indian view the woman has also a far stronger erotic disposition, and her delight in the sexual act is far greater than the man's. This is shown, indeed, in the Epic, in the tale of the king who was changed into a woman. It will be given later on. We can thus understand Lopamudrā's whim (iii, 97 ff.):

The great saint and artist in digestion Agastya wishes to wed, and woos Lopamudrā, the bewitchingly lovely princess of Vidarbha, brought up in the greatest luxury and ease. The father is not over-delighted with the proposal, and will not agree, but is afraid of the anger and curse of this powerful one. Then his daughter comes to him in his sorrow, and speaks: "Do not distress thyself because of me. Give me to Agastya, and save thyself through me, O father." So she is wedded to the Ṛishi. But when Agastya had taken Lopamudrā to wife, he spoke unto her: "Lay aside these costly garments and ornaments." Then she, with the great eyes, with thighs like banana-stems, laid aside her garments so splendid to see, so costly and thin. Then she put on clothes of rags, bast, and skins, and together with him led a strict life of religion, she the lovely one with the great eyes. The best of Ṛishis went to Gaṅgādvāra, and there gave himself up to the hardest penance together with his obedient

[1] "Mankind is made old (is worn down) by care, the warrior by fetters, woman by a life without coition, and clothes by the glow of fire." Thus a saying of Cāṇakya. See Kressler, *Stimmen indischer Lebensklugheit*, Leipzig, 1907, p. 159; cp. Garuḍapur., 115.10; Rām., iv, 35.9; etc.

wife. Filled with joyful love and lofty regard she served her master, and Agastya, the lord, showed glad love towards his wife. Then the glorious Ṛishi saw that Lopamudrā, shining with ascetic practice, had already bathed some time (after her period).[1] Gladdened by her deeds of service, her purity, self-control, splendour, and beauty, he invited her to unite. Then, folding her hands before her forehead, as though filled with shame, the fair one spoke these words lovingly to the holy man: "Doubtless the husband wedded the wife for the sake of offspring. But the joyful love I bear to thee, that do thou (too) practise, O Ṛishi. On just such a couch as I had at home in my father's palace, do thou visit me. And decked with divine ornaments I would fain glide unto thee according to my wish, thou, too, wreathed and decked. Otherwise, clad in the brown-red penitential garb of rags, I will not approach thee. Of a truth this adornment (the ascetic garb) must not be soiled in any way whatever."[2] Agastya spoke: "I have not indeed such treasures for thee, Lopamudrā, as thy father has, thou slender one." Lopamudrā spoke: "Through thy asceticism thou, rich in asceticism, hast full power to procure anything in a moment, whatsoever things there are in the world of the living." Agastya spoke: "It is as thou sayest. But through such a thing (that is, through the making use of the Yoga powers) ascetic merit is destroyed. Give me some bidding whereby my penitential merit shall not be lost." Lopamudrā spoke: "Of my ṛitu time there is only very little left, O thou rich in penance. And in other wise I have not the slightest wish to approach thee. I would indeed in no way destroy thy religious perfection

[1] Taking çl. 23 into account this is perhaps less likely thus: He saw after some time that she had bathed (bahutithe kāle). Cp. the bahutithe 'hani in i, 108.3, already known from the song of Nala (ix, 12).

[2] During sexual union the father of the family must have on a special garment, only to be used for this purpose. Āpastamba, ii, 1, 1.20. And when studying the Veda he must not wear anything he has worn during copulation. Manu, iv, 116; Vasishṭha, xiii, 26 (here: unless it has been washed). As to ornaments at this time cp. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, 8; 12 f.; 376 f.; also Jolly, "Medizin" (in the *Grundriss*), p. 38.

(dharma), but prithee bring that about which I wish." Agastya spoke : " If thou, O lovely one, art so set in thy heart upon this wish, then I will go and seek, my loved one. Do thou stay here, and live as thou wilt."

Then the complaisant husband went off to three kings one after the other to ask for what he needed. All three welcomed him most reverently at the extreme frontiers of the land, and put all their possessions at his disposal. But each time the holy man saw that their income and their expenditure exactly balanced one another, and he had no wish to bring hurt on living beings by having in such a case taken anything for himself. Accompanied by the first king, he came to the second, then together with these two to the third ; and now together with the three and on their suggestion he went on to the exceedingly rich Daitya Ilvala, well known for his malicious wickedness towards the Brahmans. He had been angered by one of the priestly caste, who would not grant him a son equal to Indra. He now magically changed his younger brother Vātāpi into a goat, slaughtered him, made him ready, and set him before the Brahman. When the Brahman had eaten him, the other called back to life him that was eaten, and the laughing monster that came walking out from the belly naturally thereby split his host in twain. Thus did Ilvala slay many Brahmans. When Agastya, with the three kings, now offered himself as his guest, to him too did he dish up his brother, magically turned into a goat and daintily made ready, and great was the fear of the three brave warriors when the good holy man ate the dish up quite calmly. But the wicked man this time had fallen into his own trap : in answer to his wonted loud " Vātāpi, come out ! " there came from under the high-souled one a wind with a mighty roar, like a thundering cloud.[1] When he went on

[1] No wonder that the genius of digestion, Agastya (Wilson's Vishṇup., iii, p. 128) shows such an overflowing health. As among the peasants in Zola's *La terre*, and elsewhere in the world, things all go their good way amid this blessed noise as the body is thus eased, so, too, the Indian sees in it a token of food well taken and of the favour of the gods, and, in fact, of general present and future happiness. See Dubois-Beauchamp [3], p. 329 ; Schmidt, *Liebe u. Ehe in Indien*, p. 397 ; E. Thurston, *Omens*, etc. (1912), p. 26.

calling to arouse his brother again, the pious belly-hero laughed him to scorn, and let him know that the brother had long ago been digested.[1] The Daitya prince was beaten and humbly offered his services. Agastya demanded for each of the three kings ten thousand oxen, and the same number of gold pieces, but for himself twice as much, and a golden chariot forthwith, with two fleet steeds before it, swift as thought. All this the poor demon had to give, and with the three kings and all the treasure the holy artist in eating and drinking drove into his hermitage. Then there was nothing more to stand in the way of the longed for love union. Lopamudrā got her princessly wish and a lusty son.

We are told, too, of a fair one who reached a remarkably high pitch of virtue in the pleasures of love. King Parīkshit rides off at full speed in the forest, lost by his retinue, and follows after a gazelle. Thus he is carried far away. Hungry, thirsty, and wearied, he sees there in the thicket an enchanting lake, covered with lotus-flowers. He throws his horse some of the lotus-stalks and sits down to rest. Then he hears sweet singing. As no human traces are anywhere to be seen, the king is filled with wonder, follows the voice, and finds a wondrous-fair maiden singing and plucking flowers. He woos her, and she consents, on condition that water must never be shown her. The king promises this, and so she becomes his wife. Meanwhile his followers come up, and she is borne in the litter to the royal city. Here Parīkshit lives with her in great joy. But the minister has a delightful grove with a splendid tank laid out, and when the king goes to walk in it with his beloved, and sees the tank, he asks her to go down into the water. She goes down below, but does not come up again. The king in despair has the water drawn off from the tank: they find only a frog. "The frogs have eaten my beloved!" the king cries, and orders a general slaughter of the frogs in his kingdom. Then the king of the frogs comes in ascetic garb, shows the prince the wrong he is doing, and tells him that the lady is his daughter Suçobhanā, who has already befooled many kings. On

[1] Another time Agastya drank up the ocean, and digested it, to the terror of the gods, only too quickly, so that they did not know now how they should fill the mighty bed again with water (i, 105).

Parīkshit's beseeching him, he gives her to him as wife. And when the king had received her, it was to him as though he had won the lordship of the three worlds ; for his heart was hers because of her surpassing excellences in the surata ; and with words choked with tears of joy he went down, did reverence to the king of the frogs, and said : "I thank thee" [1] (iii, 192.1 ff.).

That the disturbance of the enjoyment of sex was felt as especially inhuman can be easily understood. King Kalmāshapāda ("Pied Foot"),[2] who had had the curse of man-eating laid on him, comes upon a Brahman and his wife in the forest, engaged in the joys of love. They flee in terror before the business is brought to its end. But the man-eater runs after them and falls on the Brahman. The wife beseeches him with tears to have pity on his victim, for she is not yet satisfied, has her ṛitu, and wishes for a child. But the king's mind is shaken by the curse, and he eats the Brahman. Angry tears run down from the poor wife's face, and turn to fire which sets the whole neighbourhood alight. Then she curses him : "Since thou before my very eyes, before my business was done, hast eaten my husband, thou wilt leave thy life when

[1] Literally : "I have been granted a favour." This and like expressions are quite regular, and may be compared with the regular German "genade !" (French, merci) of the Middle Ages.

[2] This prince when hunting in the forest met Çakti, the eldest son of that Vasishṭha held by him in high honour. He ordered the Muni to give him the path. But the Muni insisted that under the eternal law the Kshattriya must give way to the Brahman. (Cp. Āpast., ii, 5, 11.5, and parallels). So they went on wrangling ; at length the angry king struck the priest's son with his whip "like a Rākshasa", and had the curse put on him by the insulted man that he should eat human flesh "like a Rākshasa"—one of those curses by holy men and Brahmans which almost always bring down misfortune on the innocent. But in this case a kind of strange Nemesis was at work : the first victim of the new monster was Çakti himself, then he was followed by his ninety-nine brothers into Kalmāshapāda's maw (i, 176). According to Bṛihaddevatā, vi, 28 these 100 sons were slain by the Saudāsas (sons or followers of Sudās) ; according to Sāyana on Ṛigveda, vii, 104.2 it was a Rākshasa. Cp. Muir, *Original Sanskrit Texts*, i, p. 326 ff.

thou drawest nigh to thy wife during the ṛitu. But Vasishṭha will beget thee an heir." Then she throws herself into the fire and is burned. Kalmāshapāda's wife is with him, and later she keeps him away, when he has got his wits back again, but not the memory of this event, and now wishes to approach her during the ṛitu. In his fear of dying he stands aside, and gives Vasishṭha the commission (i, 182).[1]

The, in parts very clumsy, legend of Pāṇḍu seems to be an imitation of this last one. The king shot at a couple of antelopes that were just in the joys of pairing.[2] But it was really a young Ṛishi, who had thus transformed himself and his wife, and was then love-making with her. With a human voice spoke he that had been brought to the ground : " Even they that are seized by hot desire and rage, they that are robbed of understanding, even men that take their delight in evil shun gruesome deeds. Born thou wast in the glorious race of men whose soul lived ever in virtue ; how then couldst thou, overcome by desire and greed, so go astray in thy mind ? " Pāṇḍu insisted he had every right to slay the beasts of the forest.[3] But the male antelope said : " It is not for my own sake that I upbraid thee for

[1] The same tale is, for instance, in Wilson's Vishṇupur., iii, p. 306 ff. (4th Book, 4th chapt.) ; Bhāgavatapur., iv, 9.20–39 (in both places the explanation is also given of how the king became " Pied Foot ").

[2] With this tale cp. Mārkaṇḍeyapur., lxxiv, 23 ff.

[3] Not only are all Kshattriyas in the Epic, and the holy kings of earliest times mighty hunters before the Lord, but even in the midst of a rhapsody on the ahiṃsā and the awfulness of killing living beings and of eating flesh hunting is held up to praise and declared to be wholly sinless ; for the Kshattriya while so engaged sets his own life at stake, it is slaying foes. And moreover Agastya, the great saint, and in our days the hero above all others, of the Tamil people, not only did hunt himself, but also besprinkled (that is, consecrated) the beasts of the forest as sacrifices for all the gods, and thereby made them outlaws (i, 118.12 ff. ; xiii, 115.56 ff. ; 116.15 ff. ; Vasishṭha, xiv, 15 ; Manu, v, 22). The hunt is looked on as a right and virtue of the nobles (Mahāvīracaritam ed. T. R. Ratnam Ayar, S. Rangachariar, and K. P. Parab, Bombay, 1892, p. 220 : mṛigayā ca rājñāṃ dharma eva) ; indeed it is called their eternal law (sanātana dharma, Mahānirvāṇat., xi, 142). Cp. my Daçakumāracar., p. 340 f., and Rām., iv, 18.36 ff.

killing the antelopes. But thou shouldst out of friendly thoughtfulness have taken heed that I was just pairing. For what man of sense could bring himself at such a time dear to all beings, longed after by all beings, to slay in the forest an antelope when in the act of pairing? For thee, born of the race of the Pauravas, unwearied in the doing of noble deeds, this deed is not seemly, which is cruel, unheard of, one that all men will condemn, which leads not to heaven, but to shame, and is called accursed. Thou, who understandest well the particularities and excellences of the enjoyment of women, and knowest the books of the doctrine, and the nature of religious duty and human well-being, shouldst not have done a thing which thus brings about the loss of heaven. I am a Muni purified through asceticism, my name is Kindama. It was because I felt ashamed and shy before men that I did pair with the she-antelope. Turned into an antelope, I roam about with antelopes in the depths of the forest. But as thou didst not know that, for thee it will not be as the murder of a Brahman that thou hast thus slain me, who was wearing an antelope's shape, and was mazed with love. Yet, O blinded one, thou shalt have this requital: when thou, bewildered with love, art in the embraces of thy wedded wife, thou wilt in this very state go into the world of the dead. The loved one whom thou art embracing at the time of thy death will, however, out of loving devotion, follow thee, O best of the prudent, when thou hast reached the city of the dead, into which all beings come but unwillingly." When these words had died away life left the antelope, and Pāṇḍu at once was gripped with sorrow (i, 118). From that time on he lived in strict continence as a forest penitent, together with his two wives, and he had his five sons through the gods. "One day the king with his wives was wandering through the forest in spring-time, when the forest blooms and living beings are all mazed. When Pāṇḍu beheld the forest with its bloom- and fruit-laden trees, its varied waters and lotus-clumps, love came into his heart. As now he roamed there with joy-lifted mind like an immortal, Mādrī wearing magnificent garb, alone was with him. As now he gazed on the youthful one, clad in thin garments, his love blazed up, like a fire lit in the thick forest. And as he stealthily beheld the lotus-eyed one thus alone, he was over-

come with longing and could not keep back his passion. And then the king fell with force on her that was alone, although the queen kept him off, and sought with the strength of her body to wrest herself away. But his senses filled with love, he gave no thought to the curse. In love's longing, forcibly he drew nigh to Mādrī, and himself drew nigh to death, fallen under the spell of love's desire, as he bade fear begone, goaded on by fate. As Pāṇḍu, the Kuru scion of highly virtuous mind, united himself with his wife in the joys of love, he united himself with death. Then Mādrī clasped the lifeless king, and again and again uttered loud cries of woe. Kuntī with her sons, and Mādrī's two children came to where the king was lying in this state. Then spoke Mādrī in torture these words to Kuntī : 'Come thou hither quite alone ; the children must stay there.' When Kuntī heard these words of hers, she left the children there and ran quickly to her, screaming out : 'I am death's own !' She now upbraided Mādrī with having led the king on to being stirred with love (praharsha), and called her blessed withal in that she had gazed on the prince's face stirred with love. Mādrī told her how the king would not be held back, and Kuntī claimed as eldest wife, to die with him. Mādrī, she said, must rise, and take the children into her care. But Mādrī spoke : 'I shall follow after my brave husband, for I have not yet taken my fill of love ; let the elder one grant me this. And as he was drawing nigh to me, he lost love. How should I cut this love off from him in Yama's abode there ? And I cannot fully make atonement by having borne myself impartially towards thy sons ; and so a sin would be laid upon me. With the king's body shall this dead body of mine, well wrapped, be burned. Do this for love of me, O noble one ! And take good care for the children, and love me.[1] I do not see anything more to charge thee with.' After these words the law-keeping wife, the splendid daughter of the king of the Madras, climbed swiftly up to him as he lay on the funeral pyre."[2] See, too, Rām., i, 36.5 ff.

[1] Or : Be careful and kind with my children.

[2] As in the following chapters we are told how the penitents bring the two bodies, Kuntī, and the children to Hāstinapura and hand them

If women, then, have such a healthy and natural joy in the surata, the men indeed are in no wise behind. The frequently seen ideal of the Indian, and above all of the warrior, of the blissful life is intercourse with thousands of lovely women in the bloom of youth, smiling with long lotus-eyes at the man, winding their rounded arms about his neck, and pressing their swelling firm breasts against him—women who press great

over, and how the two corpses are then burned with all proper ceremonies, this short enigmatic sentence strikes oddly. We only expect to find that Mādrī has killed herself, at least if what follows is looked on as belonging to the original, or at least to the same account. K. for this part has a true flood of words evidently from a very late period (i, 134 ff.). Kuntī here at the sight of the dead man falls to the ground like a felled tree, and gives herself up then to a long conventionally-phrased wailing. The penitents who come running up also raise cries of woe, and the five brothers come up in single file, and in the order of their ages say their little verses of lamentation. Then there follows a regular suttee scene: first the penitents do all to dissuade the two wives from offering themselves up; they were to live in chastity and good works, and so be serviceable to their dead husband. Kuntī humbly consents to this, but Mādrī repeats her earlier declarations, solemnly makes her farewell, addresses a wise exhortation to the children, and is consecrated with pious prayers by Kuntī. The Purohita Kāçyapa has bits of gold, sacrificial butter, sesame, sour milk, rice grains, water-jugs, and an axe brought by the penitents, and has the wood-pile set alight by Yudhishṭhira with fire from a horse-sacrifice (!), whereupon she dedicated to death leaps into the flames (i, 135). In what follows there is then a description given, somewhat as in the Bomb. text, of the body-burning, which in both places must now be thought of as carried out only on what is left of the bones, though this does not agree very well with the actual account. The whole is probably patched together from different versions. It looks as though the idea of the burning which had taken place before this in the penitential forest were borrowed from the example of the Brahman's wife. In her case all happens naturally; for Mādrī was the wood-pile inserted for better or worse. The fact of the penitents only reaching Hāstinapura on the 17th day after Pāṇḍu's death does not of course give any support to the text as handed down. Needless to say, however, there may have been a version of the tale in which the final burial was carried out at once in the forest, and then Mādrī's fiery death quite fits in. But there was an unwillingness, I think, to lose the solemn and splendid public ceremony. Cp. i, 150.10 ff.

swelling hips, and thighs like banana-stems against his body, who give lips red as the bimba-fruit to be sucked by his, and who as they glow in the surata not only receive, but also give. And thus the princes of Old India in particular were much given to the joys of love, and Indian literature tells us of many who, owing to an over-eager indulgence in the surata, fell victims to consumption and an early death. So it was with Vicitravīrya, who secretly turned all the women's heads, and through his two big brown wives, with their black curly hair, red high-arched finger-nails, and swelling hips and breasts, became from a dharmātman (virtuous-souled) a kāmātman (one whose soul is love, i, 102.66 ff. ; v,147. 25 ; cf. i, 119.3–4 ; v, 11.10 f.). As he died without children, Vyāsa had to call up offspring for him. The same lot of an early death, uncrowned by offspring, fell to King Vyushitāçva, only too madly in love with his intoxicatingly lovely wife, Kakshīvatī. Then after his death he brought about that which in life was not possible, as will be told later (i, 121.17 ff.). More will be said when we deal with the love life of the Epic hero. Then, too, the sexual embrace comes before us as a healing remedy : The soul has the greatest influence on the body, " for through pain of the soul the body is heated in torment like water in a pitcher by a glowing ball of iron." [1] Skilful leeches therefore in dealing with bodily ills first remove those of the soul, and this is done by their providing the man with sexual enjoyment (iii, 2.21 ff.).

It is well known also that in the more formal poetry of India and in the doctrinal books various refinements play a great part in the ordinary love embrace. Of these the Epic refers to one only : in the description of the horses wandering about in a battle we find as follows : " Trampled by the hoofs of these steeds, the earth shone in many colours like a woman that is marked with scratches this way and that by the nails (of the lover) " (ix, 9.13). To heighten the powers of love [2] flesh

[1] " As thought, so the mind ; as the mind (manas), so the body becomes " (sick and healthy, too). Pañcaçatīprabandha ed. Ballini, p. 34.

[2] Means of heightening the sexual powers of the man, so much even that in one night he can satisfy a thousand women, are known in

has from times of old been recommended, and the Indians of the Epic, above all the Kshattriyas, are great, nay enthusiastic, meat-eaters. So even that pattern of virtue, Yudhishṭhira, acknowledges in xiii, 115 that he prizes flesh above everything, and would now learn the good and the evil of flesh-eating from the dying Bhīshma. And Bhīshma grants, too, that there is nothing better than flesh, and that among other things it has many advantages for those who are given up with all their

the Old Indian literature in great abundance. See Rich. Schmidt, *Indische Erotik*, 842–857; Garuḍapur., 182.2; 184.13; 192.20–23; 202.25–28; Bṛihatsaṃh., 76; Agnipur., 302.15–16; Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes*, ii, 205; iii, 235; etc. It is to be noted that onions, garlic, and beans play a part in this. Because of their magical nature onions, leeks, and garlic are foods strictly forbidden in the law literature (Āpast., i, 5, 17.26; Manu, v, 19; Yājñav., i, 176; Vishṇu, li, 3), and the well-known prohibition of beans would seem, seeing this effect of the anti-Pythagorean field-fruit, easy to understand. As I know from one who has lived long in India, one hears there in our days as the explanation of the onion tabu its too great likeness to flesh. But it is the well-known erotic, magical, and religious importance of the onion plants that seems to be the main reason here. Onions and garlic are found as aphrodisiacs e.g. in Samayamātṛikā, ii, 26. Garlic is among the Ainu the favourite food of the gods (*Anthropos*, v, 766); onions and leeks were talismans among the Classical peoples (Schurtz, *Urgesch. d. Kult.*, 599); and to-day among the South Slavs the garlic is "a protection against witchcraft and haunting" (Krauss, *Sitte u. Brauch*, 398; cp. 545; *Slav. Volkforschungen*, pp. 37, 66, 95, 148, 250). The fire of love, too, in Slav belief is made hotter by the eating of garlic (Krauss, *Sitte*, etc., 240 f.). Cp. further R. Andree, *Ethnol. Parallel.* (1878), i, 41–43; Th. Zachariae, *Kleine Schriften*, 358; K. E. Franzos, *Vom Don zur Donau* (1878), 1, 211; ii, 8; 80; also MBh. K, xii, 141.91 f.; xiii, 91.38 f. That among the old Hindus, too, the onion was prized as a food, anyhow by many, seems to be shown by the tale of the onion-thief, which has wandered into the West and is known there in many places: he was caught, and was given the choice of paying 100 rupees, getting 100 blows with a stick, or eating 100 onions; he chose at first, of course, the onions, but then, with streaming eyes and a face drawn in torment, the cudgelling, and under the pain of the first stroke quickly chose the money fine. See Hertel, *Studien z. vergl. Literaturgesch.*, Bd. 5, p. 129 ff., and especially Zachariae, ibid., Bd. 6, p. 356 ff.

soul to the " villagers' custom " (pleasures of love) ; and there is no doubt but that flesh arises out of the seed (çl. 9 ff.).[1] Çiva and his wife are the ideal figures, carried beyond all bounds, even to grotesqueness, of the Indian power of imagination, in this respect, that they can immeasurably lengthen the embraces of love. When under the mountains this god had wedded the daughter of the prince, he set himself with his wife to sporting in bed. But a long thousand years of the gods went by,[2] and the heaven-dwellers grew anxious lest the fruit of so endless a begetting should be far too mighty for the world to tolerate. They went therefore to the tireless pair, and begged Çiva that for the weal of all beings he would put a check on his manly powers. He graciously consented, but asked who should catch up the seed already aroused. The earth was chosen for this, but it filled up altogether with it, and so the god of fire was called in to help ; he penetrated this flood, and so there arose the mountain Çvetaparvata, and the heavenly cane-forest, where from the god's procreative fluid the war-god Kārtikeya or Kumāra came into being (Rām., i, 36.5 ff.).[3]

Neither myths like these, however, nor the sensuality so often blazing up, in any way alter the ethical view of the surata found in the Epic, especially in its didactic parts. Here also it comes before us as something unclean. The evil spirits Pramatha are asked by the gods, the dead, and the Ṛishis what it is that

[1] Ascetic literature lays stress in India on the view that one must abstain from eating flesh for the very reason that it hinders the control of the senses. So, for instance, Amitagati, Subhāshitasaṃdoha, xxi, 13 (also honey has an erotic effect, xxii, 18). The main reason for the turning away from flesh is suggested by me in my *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, p. 45 (middle) ; 370, note.

[2] A year for men is equal to a day for the gods (e.g. Manu, i, 67).

[3] Somadeva gives a still more drastic turn to the legend (Kathās., 20.60 ff.). According to MBh., xiii, 84.60 ff., where no mention is made of the love joys of the heavenly pair lasting so long, the gods come to them and get Çiva to promise to beget no offspring, for they are anxious lest it should be too powerful and terrible. Umā's mother-urge is thus scornfully cheated of its rights, and "since she is a woman, to the gods she utters the hot, raw words of the curse : Now ye, too, shall all be childless ! "

makes anyone ucchishṭa (usually he that has not yet undertaken the needful washings after eating), açuci (unclean), and kshudra (low, common), and thereby fall a victim to their destroying power. And they answer among other things: "Through copulation men become ever ucchishṭa, and if they have practised the 'upside-down'" (xii, 131.4).[1] And in the golden age there was no sexual union whatever. So we find in xii, 207.37 ff.: "So long as men chose to retain the body, so long they lived; there was no fear of death. Nor did they know either the custom of copulation; their offspring came into being through the mere wish. In the days of the Tretāyuga (silver age) thereafter, the children were begotten by touch; for they, too, had not the custom of copulation. In the Dvāpara age arose among creatures the custom of copulation." In our own evil or Kali age it is now needful; but it is regulated. It must not be practised in the open air (ākāçe, xii, 228.45; cp. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, 237), and must be practised secretly (xiii, 162.47; xii, 193.17[2]); in the latter passage is added that it must also be in lawful wise, which may mean the restriction to one's own wife, but according to Nīl. refers to the ṛitu. Then there is only the vulva for it; done in

[1] Adharottara is here probably an expression for "perverse" love (viparīta surata), for the usual meaning (here also accepted by the schol.) does not fit very well.—Here belongs also iii, 136.13: To the penitent Yavakrī(ta) there comes a magical being (kṛityā) in the shape of a woman beloved by him, infatuates him, and takes away his water-jug. Since he is now ucchishṭa and robbed of his water-jug, an enemy Rākshasa gets him in his power. Then even the public harlot washes her hands and feet after the act of love, and rinses her mouth out (Kuṭṭanīmata, 162 f.). A bath or wash afterwards is enjoined, for instance, in Manu, v, 144; Vishṇu, xxii, 67; Parāçara, xii, 1; Mahānirvāṇatantra, vii, 75. Cp. Kāmasūtra, p. 179 of the edit.; and Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen d. abendländ. Kirche*, 1851, p. 216: Maritus, qui cum uxore sua dormierit, lavet se, antequam intret in ecclesiam. Among the Hovas of Madagascar for one week before the circumcision the parents and sponsors of the child to be circumcised must abstain from coition, otherwise *l'opération ne réussirait pas bien* (*Anthropos*, iv, 378). And dozens of such cases. Cp. too Thurston, *Omens*, etc., p. 29.

[2] Cp. e.g. Vasishṭha, vi, 9.

the mouth it is a crime (vii, 73.43). The āsyamaithuna is also named as one of the dreadful things making their appearance towards the end of the world: Bahuprajāḥ, hrasvadehāḥ, çīlācāravivarjitāḥ, mukhebhagāḥ ŝtriyo, rājan, bhavishyanṭi yugakshaye (iii, 188.41; cp. vii, 73.38 ff.).[1] So, too, homosexuality is a dreadful sin: "The blind ones, evil-livers, very foolish ones, however, who find their delight in intercourse with a base womb (especially of an animal, but also of a woman of low rank) (viyonau), and with men, are born again as men incapable of begetting" (xiii, 145.52).[2] Here, too, seems to belong the passage from the description of the evil ŝtate of things at the time when a world age is coming to its end: "Men and women will walk their ways after their own wishes, and not be able to suffer one another, when the end of a yuga has come about. Then, when the end of the world is at hand, the

[1] We are told by Nīl.: The women in Bengal (Vaṅgeshu) are known for beginning with their mouth the business of the vulva to excite the man's desires, owing to their excessive craving for the joys of love. Such a thing is, of course, ŝtrongly condemned by the law books. Whoso has unnatural intercourse with his wife, his forefathers have to live the month through in his seed (Vasishṭha, xii, 22 f.); according to Mahānirvāṇat., xi, 44 he is even to be punished with death. For unnatural desires, of whatever kind, the law writings and the Purāṇas lay down various purifications and penances (and expulsion from the caŝte). Anyone practising such lewdness or other forbidden sexual intercourse is, according to Baudhāyana, iii, 7.2, the same as a Brahman-murderer.

[2] But perhaps more likely so: "the blind ones, evil-livers, among men (persons) very foolish ones, who delight themselves with intercourse with a base womb," which then of course might be meant for sodomy; according to xii, 228.45 rather for intercourse with women of low standing. Cp. xii, 227.14, and as to viyoni also xii, 296.11; xiii, 104.133; 106.72; K, xiii, 53.1 f. For: maithunaṃ purusheshu compare: maithunaṃ puṃsi in Manu, xi, 68. According to this passage and Vishṇu, xxxviii, 5 by homosexual perversion the man loses his caŝte; while Manu, xi, 175, Vishṇu, liii, 4, prescribe bathing in the clothes as the atonement. Lesbian love between girls is punished with a heavy money fine and ten ŝtrokes of the whip (çiphā); the married woman who thus ŝtains a maid shall be at once shaved bald, have two fingers cut off, and be led on an ass through the place. Manu, viii, 369 f.

woman will not find content with her husband, nor the man with his wife" (iii, 190.45, 50).[1] And you shall not be a thrall to the pleasures of love, when you celebrate a sacrifice to the forefathers (çrāddha). The çrāddhamaithunika is set before us, in vii, 17.32, as a great sinner. All those taking part are then bound to keep chaste. "It is held that on this day copulation is to be avoided. It is as one pure that you shall always partake of the death-meal (çrāddha). He that gives or shares in a death-meal, and goes to a woman, his fathers must lie that month in the seed" (xiii, 125.42, 24).[2] Further, we find (xiii, 104.29): "In the first night of the new moon, in the night of the full moon, in the fourteenth night and in the eighth night of each half of the month you shall always practise complete chastity."[3]

[1] Also MBh., xii, 228.73 would belong here, if kaçcic chishyasakho guruḥ has been rightly translated by Deussen: "Now and then the teacher was the disciple's lover" (the immorality which spread among the Daityas is being spoken of). But perhaps it only means that the disciple's reverential relation towards the teacher vanished, and too little restraint, or over-familiarity, came in its stead. As an evil habit of the degenerates it may here be further mentioned that the men dressed in women's clothes and the women in men's, and they so associated with one another (çl. 68), which reminds us of other phenomena known. Cp. xiii, 104.85.—The passage in the text (iii, 190.45, 50) could, it is true, also be speaking only of adultery.

[2] The same threat is in Mārk.-Pur., xxxi, 31–34, while according to Vasishtha, xi, 37 they have to live on the seed. Cp. Manu, iii, 250; Gautama, xv, 22. The sinner himself goes to hell. Garuḍapurāṇasārod., iv, 41.

[3] Not on the 8th, 14th, 15th day of the half month (the Parvan days) nor on the four days when the moon changes must love be indulged in. Baudh., i, 11, 21.18 (cp. 22); Vasishtha, xii, 21; Manu, iii, 45; iv, 128; Yājñav., i, 79; Vishṇu, lxix, 1; Mārk.-Pur., xxxiv, 43–44. Otherwise the sinner goes to hell. Garuḍapurāṇasārod., iv, 41. The root of these (and of who knows how many similar and seemingly purely ethical) precepts is shown quite correctly in Baudhāyana, i, 11, 21.19: "On the Parvan days evil spirits are in wait." Especially dangerous then are naturally an empty house, a graveyard, a tree, water, etc. (see e.g. Vishṇu, lxix, 7, 8; MBh., xiii, 131.4 f.; i, 170.8–11; 15 f.; 69; Manu, xi, 174 f. (= Agnipur., 169.36 f.)).

Cp. xiii, 104.89 ; 228.45 ; K, xiii, 211.43 ; 233.50. And for the permitted times, too, the rule holds : "Only in the evening (in the night) !" For the morning belongs to the religious duties, midday to the worldly (artha). Cp. for instance xiii, 22.27 ; vii, 73.38 ff. ; ii, 5.20, and comment. Among the most dreadful sins coition during the day is given in vii, 73.38 ff. ; so also in xiii, 93.121 ; 94.24 ; and in the self-cursing formula of Arjuna, already given (vii, 73.41, 43).[1]

[1] The same prohibition is in the law books. According to Mārk.-Pur., xiv, 74, 76 he that copulates by day is badly tortured in hell. So in other Purāṇas. Furthermore in the morning and at twilight continence must be observed. Mārk.-Pur., xxxiv, 82.73 ; Vishṇusmṛiti, lxix, 10. And in a vehicle must Venus not be sacrificed to (e.g. Manu, xi, 175 ; Vishṇu, liii, 4 ; Agnipur., 169.37 (= Manu, 175, cp. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, 237)). Thus then the conduct of the loving couples in Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* and Maupassant's *Bel-Ami* and doubtless elsewhere, who quench their desires in the hired coach, is doubly wicked. Speaking, too, during the "work of darkness" is banned (Agnipur., 166.17a–18a), naturally, as with the other dispositions there given, so as not to arouse evil influences. A shorter compilation of rules for sexual intercourse with the wife is to be found in Manu, iii, 45 (cp. Bühler's parallels), and a good one, somewhat more in detail, in Vishṇu, lxix ; particularly excellent is Carakasaṃhitā, iv, 8, and good, too, is Garuḍapur., Pretakalpa, xxxii, 7–19 ; Bṛihat-saṃh., 78.11 ff. ; etc. Much that is beautiful is given us, for instance, in Vishṇupurāṇa, iii, 11.110 ff., a passage which may here be given as an example of such similar precepts often to be found in the law books and other writings : "At the time of the ṛitu do thou, O lord of the earth, approach thy wife, happy, under a constellation bearing a masculine name, at a propitious time, during the best even-numbered nights. But go not to the unbathed woman, to the sick one, to the menstruating one, not to her without desire, not to the angry one, not to one in ill-repute, not to one with child, not to one uncomplaisant, not to her that longs for another man or is without love (or : that is unwilling), not to another man's wife, not to one that is faint with hunger, not to one that has overeaten. Nor do thou thyself be weighed down with such qualities as these. Bathed, wearing a wreath and scented, bursting with strength (sphīta), not wearied or hungry, filled with love and tender inclination, let the man go to sexual union. The fourteenth and the eighth day of the half-month, the day of the new moon, as also the day of the full moon and also the

But the Epic particularly often stresses the prohibition against a man embracing any woman other than his own wife. This has already been touched on. A few more passages are given here. He who in other things is pious, and is content with his own wife, and does not even in thought covet another woman, wins a glorious lot in the other world, and the same merit even as one that offers a thousand horse-sacrifices (xiii, 107.10, 50 ff.).[1] Subhadrā bewailing her son, says in

day when the sun comes into a new house of the zodiac—these are the Parvan days, O ruler of princes. The man who on these Parvan days partakes of oil, flesh, and woman goes after death to hell, where dung and urine must be his food. . . . Neither outside the vulva, nor in the vulva of another (not human) being, nor using medicines (exciting or strengthening the manly powers), nor in the house of a Brahman, a god, or a Guru, let a man give himself up to love's pleasures, nor near holy trees (or: village shrines, caitya), nor by cross-roads, nor in places where many roads meet, nor in graveyards, nor in groves, nor in the water, O lord of the earth. Neither on the Parvan days named, nor in either twilight, nor troubled by urine or stool, must the wise man go to the joyful union. Copulation on the Parvan days brings misfortune on men, that by day brings evil (or: sin), that done on the ground has sickness after it, and calamitous is that done in water. Let none ever approach the wedded wife of another, not even in thought, how much less in words. Not even longing (asthibandha) have those who lie with such a woman; after death such a man goes to hell, and already here his life is shortened. Intercourse with the wedded wife of another is destruction for men, even in both worlds. Mindful of this, let the wise man go to his own wife, when she is in her ṛitu and free from the blemishes already told; and if she has a longing for love, then even outside the ṛitu." (Translated after the Bomb. edit. Çāka 1811.) The places and times here set forth, but not exhaustively, have of course become tabu because of their magical danger. A highly instructive parallel to them is offered, for example, by the monstrously intricate rules of behaviour for the Snātaka, which take up so much room in the Gṛihya-sūtras, the law books, and the Purāṇas, and form a real store-house for the history of superstition and of mankind.

[1] But he has also the duty laid on him to speak no untruth, even for his father and mother, to sacrifice to the fire god constantly for twelve months, and to eat havis, when the eleventh day has come; and as the two last-mentioned things are extraordinarily meritorious,

vii, 78.24 : " Go thou, my little son, to the same place whither come through their chastity the Munis obeying strict vows, and whither come the men with but one wife " (cp. çl. 31.32). " The men who find delight only in their own wife, and ever act towards other women as they do towards their mother, their sister, their daughter, they whose eyes through good ways of life are shut to strange women, who do no hurt to strange women even in thought, even when these women approach them secretly with love—such men come into heaven " (xiii, 144.10–15 ; 33). In the long and solemn imprecatory formula wherein Bharata wishes all the most dreadful horrors and evils for him who has been glad to see Rāma banished, he also says : " May the evil-minded one, with whose consent the noble one went forth, set in the second place his wife that has bathed after her period and is keeping her ritu ! Given up to the pleasures of a love against law and virtue, blinded, may he leave his own wife on one side, and consort with other women, he with whose consent the noble one went forth ! " (Rām., ii, 75.52, 55). Mahābhārata, xii, 90.32 says emphatically : " With unknown women, with such beings as belong to the third sex, with women of loose morals, with the wives of others, and with maidens let not a man have union." Besides the unknown woman, the woman with child is named as forbidden in xiii, 104.47.[1] Furthermore, we read (xiii, 104.20 ff.) : In all castes a man must never approach the wife of another. For there is nought in the world which so shortens life as that the man on earth should visit the wife of another (= Manu, iv, 134). As many pores as are on women's bodies, so many years will he sit in

the chastity and truthfulness that is demanded besides them, play, anyhow in the present text, a secondary part.

[1] The prohibition of intercourse with the pregnant woman is well known to be widespread throughout the world, and of course above all because the pregnant woman is looked on as unclean and bringing disaster. See Ploss-Bartels [4], i, 601 ff. ; Elsie Clews Parsons, *The Old-Fashioned Woman* (1913), p. 80 ff. If her bare shadow falls on a snake, it becomes blind. Crooke, *Pop. Rel.*, ii, 143. And yet Vasishṭha, xii, 24, at least, brings forward an old and holy authority for women being allowed to share in the sport of love, even when far advanced in pregnancy, in virtue of a favour granted them by Indra.

hell. "Men who give themselves up to promiscuous intercourse (prakīrṇamaithuna) have, as men of vice and spurners of order, a short life, go to hell, and invite their being reborn impotent" (xiii, 104.12 ; 145.53).[1] He that touches another's wife is born as a wolf, as a dog, as a jackal, then born as a vulture, a snake, a heron, as also a crane (baka). The blinded villain who defiles his brother's wife becomes for a year a kokila cock. He that to slake his lust lays hands on the wife of his friend (cf. xiii, 101.16), of his teacher (guru), or of the king, is born after death as a swine. He will be five years a swine, ten years a porcupine, five years a cat, ten years a cock, three months an ant, one month an insect (kīṭa), and then, having had these embodiments (saṃsāra, cp. iii, 183.70), will be born in a worm's existence (kṛimiyoni). In this worm's existence he will live fourteen months, and then, having atoned for his evil (adharma), be born again as a human being (xiii, 111.75 ff.). For five offences, indeed, there is no atonement (nishkṛiti), through them a man becomes an outcast, unworthy of intercourse (asambhāshya) with forefathers, gods,[2] and pious men, goes to hell, is roasted there like a fish, and has to live there on matter and blood. These are : the murder of a Brahman, cow-slaying, intercourse with another's wife, unbelief, and living on a woman (xiii, 130.37–40). In the same way Rām., iii, 38.30 teaches : "There is no greater sin than to touch another's wife." On the other hand xii, 35.25 prescribes, indeed, an atonement for him that seduces the wife of another ; but it is noteworthy that it is the same vow of mortification that is also laid on the Brahman-murderer. The former, however, only need keep it for a year. "Then he is free of his sin." This punishment falls on him "as a robber of another's property" (paradārāpahārī tu parasyāpaharan vasu). The matter is in xiii, 129.1–4, looked at from the same, though sharper defined, standpoint : He that lies with another man's wife has to bear the same guilt as he that takes property away from a Brahman, which is, indeed, an offence crying to heaven. He is equal to a Brahman-murderer (v, 35.46 ff.). But if

1 They also fall out of the caste (e.g. Agnipur., p. 644).

2 The explanation of this expression given in xiii, 130.3 is that gods and forefathers scorn his sacrificial gift.

the Brahman himself takes some woman who is not his wedded wife to his bed, then to atone for his guilt he must lie with his (bare) back on the grass (xii, 165.28), and so, and only in three years does he wipe out the sin of a night. The member of the priestly caste becomes apaṅkteya, loses his social position, if he is a pander or brothel-keeper (kuṇḍāçin), has his wife's lover living in the house (that is probably, also makes profit from him), and if he visits the wife of another. On the other hand he is deemed to be a brahmacārin or continent man, if he at the time of the ṛitu always embraces his lawful wife (xiii, 9.7 ff., 28, 29; 89.7–9).[1] But also the noble view that sexual self-control is the holy and pure thing finds expression. In xii, 269.27 Kapila sets forth the rule: "Let the man delight no woman that is the wife of a hero,[2] nor let him call a woman when she is not in the ṛitu; let him keep in his person the pious vow of wedded faith (bhāryāvrata).[3] Thus will the gate of his sexual parts be warded."[4] There is then the magnificent verse, xii, 210.37, wherein the body is called "the holy city with the nine gates" (navadvāraṃ puraṃ puṇyaṃ).[5] Among the four

[1] That the priestly caste in Old India was not so very distinguished for its chaste living is shown indeed by this passage, but still more so by many others in the literature. But it is well to use some care in accepting tales of priests not only among ourselves, but also in the Hindu land. According to an old proverb the he-goat and a Veda-learned Brahman are the lewdest of beings. Āpast., ii, 6, 14.13. In the Epic, however, what is told of them does not give a particularly unfavourable picture of their sexual morality. That they anyhow preached a loftier sexual ethic is also shown by numerous passages in the Epic.

[2] It would be quite easy instead of vīrapatnīm to read vīrāpatnīm, "let him delight no woman that is not his wife, O hero." But a hero's wife is very dangerous (xii, 82.51).

[3] So Manu, ix, 101, enjoins: "Unto death shall they keep wedded faith one to another. This in a word is what is to be recognized as the highest duty of wife and husband."

[4] The often-appearing thought of the gates of the human body is then dealt with in the following çloka, and appears, too, elsewhere in the Epic.

[5] What is probably meant is the nine openings (srotas, kha, chidra): mouth, nostrils, ears, eyes, anus, penis. The wholly arbitrary interpretation of Nīlakaṇṭha is, indeed, different, and besides it there is a like one

gates that must be watched over is found the male member, both in xii, 269.23 ff., and in xii, 299.28 ; 335.4.[1] If the wife is unfaithful to the husband or the husband to the wife, then this is an evil state of things which forebodes universal and dreadful disaster (xvi, 2.11). Of course, he, too, is a wicked man who helps others to adultery : " He that seduces or touches another's wife, or gets her for another, goes to hell " (xiii, 23.61).[2]

in vi, 29, 13. But later on I see that he gives in xiv, 42, 56 the same interpretation as myself. In the passage before us we could as against the scholiast choose rather to give the five sense organs and the five active organs according to çl. 30, but to reckon the tongue and speech as one only, thus : ear, eye, skin, tongue, nose, anus, generative member, hand, foot. This, too, seems to be pointed to by çl. 32, which then would be translated : " In perceiving taste it is called tongue, in uttering it is called speech." Cp. xii, 210.32. Not so beautiful, but on the other hand more common, not in India alone, is the well-known view that the body and its openings are clean above, unclean below the navel. Baudhāyana, i, 5, 10.19 (= i, 5.75 ; according to Taitt.-Saṃh., vi, 1, 3.4) ; Vishṇu, xxiii, 31 ; Manu, v, 132 ; Cp. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, p. 9. Therefore it is that at death the soul of the good man escapes through one of the upper openings, the soul of the bad man through the lower ones. For instance, Agnipur., 371.3 ff ; Garuḍapurāṇasārod., ix, 36 f.; Crooke, *Anthropos*, iv, 468 (in the last-mentioned that of the bad man through the anus, that of the pious man through brahmarandhra).

[1] The three others are arms (and feet), the tongue, and the belly.

[2] The views held in the law literature and the Purāṇas on intercourse with the woman that is not one's wedded wife, but particularly with the wife of another, are no less severe. Here we can only give a few instances. The adulterer has a short life and goes to a hell of torment. Mārk.-Pur., xxxiv, 62 ; xiv, 76 ; Agnipur., 203.15, 20. He shall be put to death, unless he is a Brahman. Baudh., ii, 2, 4.1 ; Manu, viii, 539 (cp. 352 f.). In adultery the man's penis and testicles are to be cut off, in evil-doing with a maiden his property shall be seized, and he banished from the land. Āpast., ii, 10, 26.20–21 ; 27.1. The king must then shield such women and maidens from stain and hand them over to their guardian, if they promise to undertake the prescribed penances. When they have done these they must be treated as they were before their fall. Cp. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, index under " Ehebruch ". Besides these, however, there are also lighter punish-

ments: chastity for so many years, a year of the Mahāvrata mortification, the highest possible and also lower money fines, and so forth. The adulterer is a thief (caura). Yājñav., ii, 301, etc. (cp. Saṃyuttanikāya, ii, p. 188). Intercourse with another's wife is reckoned among criminal deeds of violence (Nārada, xvi, 2), and according to 6, along with murder of any kind it belongs to the worst class of all. The punishments are: Not less than 1,000 paṇa fine, confiscation of all property, banishment, branding, cutting off the offending member, death (8). Cp. Bṛihaspati, xxii, 1. So, as in robbery and violence, in adultery also the witnesses are not to be, as happens in other cases, most carefully examined first, but anyone can here be a witness. Manu, viii, 72; Nārada, i, 189 (p. 101 in Jolly's edit.); Yajñav., ii, 72; Vishṇu, viii, 6. The adulterer, indeed, is reckoned among the seven kinds of murderers (ātatāyin), as the man, too, who raises his hand to utter a curse against another, and he that makes use of a destructive magic from the Atharvaveda against another man; and as a murderer he can be slain without further ado. Vishṇu, v, 189 ff. Cp. MBh. K, xii, 14.79–83. So Mahānirvāṇatantra, xi, 53 enjoins: If a man comes upon his wife in another man's arms, and kills both, then the king must not punish him. A memorable case out of Rājput history is told by Tod, *Rājasthan*, ii, 523: Prince Gopināth of Bundi goes in the night to a Brahman's wife. The husband takes and in the end binds him, goes to the sinner's royal father, and announces he has taken a thief who has stolen his honour. What did the man deserve? "Death." The injured man hurries home, beats in the prince's head with a hammer, and throws him into the street. The king, his father, silently submits. Among the Gurkhas, who are said to descend from the Rājputs, the husband kills the adulterer publicly. Wright, *Hist. of Nepal*, 32. In the case of certain women there can be no question whatever of adultery. The wives of actors and singers have already been mentioned on this point. As to the abhisārikā see later. The following can be freely visited: the public harlot (veçyā), the svairiṇī, if she is not a Brahman, and the slave-woman who is not held back (demanded) by her master (dāsī nishkāsinī "who may go out freely"). But intercourse with such women as these (bhujishyā) is adultery too, if they are the concubines (parigraha) of another man. So Nārada, xii, 78 f. But on the other hand, Bṛihaspati, xv, 7 says: He that lies with the slave-girl of a man becomes himself his slave. And in other places too she is found not without protection. Yājñav., ii, 290 lays down: In the case of confiscated serving-women and slave-women (harlots? avaruddhāsu dāsishu bhujishyāsu tathaiva ca) the man must pay a 50 paṇa fine. Cp. Kauṭilya (transl.), 311.10 ff.; Manu, viii, 363. The svairiṇī

In the Epic, intercourse with the teacher's wife is often marked out as peculiarly shameful. Such a sinner is reincarnated as one without manly powers (xiii, 145.53; see also xiii, 111.64 ff., and cp. Manu, xi, 49; xii, 58). The atoning punishment here is as follows: "He that stains (gurutalpin) the teacher's bed shall seat himself on a glowing iron plate (çilāṃ taptām ayasīṃ),[1] cut off his own member, and go away with uplifted eyes. Freed from his body, he is freed from his

is according to Nārada, xii, 49 ff. of four kinds: (1) the woman who leaves her husband, and for love lives with another man; (2) she who after her husband's death rejects her brothers-in-law and other kinsmen of her husband, and for love unites herself with a stranger; (3) she who through want, or, being bought for money, gives herself to a man; (4) she who after a lawful marriage is made the wife of another by force. The earlier one among these four is always worse than the one following. Elsewhere the analyses of the concepts are less detailed. Yājñav., i, 67 says that her lover must be of the same caste if the name svairiṇī is to hold. And the nearer determination of what adultery really is leaves nothing to wish for on the score of severity. Especially detailed are Manu, viii, 354–363; Nārada, xii, 62–69; Yājñav., ii, 283 ff.; Bṛihaspati, xxiii, 2 ff. He that is together anywhere with the wife of another, as for instance at the junction of streams, at bathing-places, in gardens, in forests, speaks with her, sports with her, sends her all kinds of gifts, kisses her, winks or smiles at her, touches her on the clothes or ornaments or body, particularly at unseemly places, or lets himself be touched by her there, sits on a bed with her, takes her by the hand, the hair, or the hem of her garment, and so forth, such a one by this commits adultery, although not of equally serious kind in each case. So, too, belong here the sending of a procuress, of a letter, and like actions. Indeed, if a man from vanity, blindness, or boastfulness himself says: "I have enjoyed this woman," then he is guilty of adultery (saṃgrahaṇa) according to the holy tradition (Nārada, xii, 69). Maithuna (copulation), indeed, is according to old Indian teaching eightfold: smaraṇa (thinking of it), kīrtana (speaking of it), keli (dallying), prekshaṇa (viewing), guhyabhāshaṇa (secret converse), saṃkalpa (firm will to copulate), adhyavasāya (resolve to do it), kriyānishpatti (the actual accomplishment). Each part is in itself maithuna.

[1] This meaning for çilā is not found, indeed, in the dictionaries, but Nīl. anyhow gives for iii, 146.24 the explanation: çilāḥ samapashāṇāḥ çayanāsanayogyāḥ, upalās tadanye.

unclean deed ; women are redeemed from such-like deeds by making earneſt endeavour (yatta, according to Nīl., making abſtention in food and pleasure) for a year. But he who carries out the 'great vow',[1] and gives away even all his possessions, or for the sake of the teacher is killed in battle, sets himself free of his unclean deed" (xii, 35.20 ff.). "The evil-begotten, evil-minded man that violates his maſter's marriage-bed is made clean by clasping a glowing ſtatue with the shape of a woman, and so meeting death. Or let him take his penis and testicles[2] himself into his hand, and go ſtraight off into the region of the Nirṛiti (to the south-eaſt) till he falls down (dead), or else give up his life on behalf of a Brahman ; thereby he becomes clean.[3] Or he receives honour here and after death,

[1] The "great vow" (mahāvrata) is the giving up even of water for a month. Nīl.

[2] All three of which he has himself cut off.

[3] The same bloody punishment by loss of manhood, etc., is found in Manu, xi, 105 f. ; Āpaſt., i, 9, 25.1 ; Gaut., xxiii, 10 ; Vas., xx, 13 ; Baudh., ii, 1, 1.15 ; Yājñav., iii, 259. According to Manu, xi, 104 ; Gaut., xxiii, 8 ; Baudh., ii, 1, 1.13, the offender is to burn himself on a glowing iron bed (gridiron) ; according to Manu, xi, 1 ; Āpaſt., i, 9, 25.2 ; Gaut., xxiii, 9 ; Vas., xx, 14, he is to clasp the glowing iron figure of a woman ; he is to be burned in a hollow iron ſtatue, under which fire is ſtirred up, according to Āpaſt., i, 10, 28.15 ; Manu, xi, 106 f. Yājñav., iii, 260, lets him be cleansed of his sin through mortifications ; Agnipur., 169.20 adds self-caſtration to this (cp. 664). Manu, ix, 237 ; Vishṇu, v, 7 ; Nārada, Pariçishṭa, 44 prescribe that the gurutalpin shall be branded with the yoni (vulva) ; so too Agnipur., 227.50. See also Meyer, Kauṭilya, and *Altind. Rechtsſchr.*, index under "Brandmarkung". It muſt not be left unmentioned that this sin also, like so many others, according to Smṛiti can easily be made good so long as it is kept hidden, namely by lip-penance and purse-mortification, that is, by grinding out mantras (Manu, xi, 252), and at the same time making the pious gift of a milch-cow (Yājñav., iii, 305). But on the other hand Smṛiti speaks of many sexual offences that are the same as the ſtaining of the teacher's marriage-bed, and a long liſt of women is given who are on the same level with the guru's wife. Here we give only one or two : a woman who is the man's ward, a virgin, the wife of a friend, or of the son, a Pariah woman, the ſiſter's friend, a kinswoman

if he makes a horse-sacrifice or a gosava or agnishṭoma sacrifice in the rightful way [1] (xii, 165.49 ff.). According to xii, 165.34, this offence, along with the drinking of spirits (surāpāna) and Brahman-murder, is among the monstrous ones for which there is no atonement laid down (anirdeçya), and which can only be made good again by death (cf. Manu, xi, 55). Also for sexual intercourse with a woman of higher caste there is the sharpest punishment. In this case the sinning woman also, whose punishment in general belongs not here, but to the chapter dealing with her relations with her husband, comes under public justice: "As to the woman that sins against her husband, especially if she has been held back, she shall be made to carry out the same expiatory vow as is the man after adultery.[2] If she leaves a better bed to go to another, a worse man,[3] then shall the king have her torn (ardayet) asunder by dogs on a wide public place. But let the wise one put the man on a glowing bed of iron, and let him heap up wood, and there shall the evil-

(sagotrā), a begging nun (pravrajitā). Vishṇu, xxxvi, 4 ff.; Yājñav., iii, 231 ff. So, too, intercourse with a woman-ascetic is in Nārada, xii, 73 held to be the same as incest (contrariwise Kauṭilya (transl.), 364.12 ff. and Yājñav., ii, 293 in this case have only a 24 paṇa fine. Cp. Kauṭilya 364.35 ff.; and Manu, viii, 363). That incest, which is given a very wide meaning, can only be wiped out through death by fire, castration, expulsion from the caste, and the like is easily understood. See Bühler's Manu, xi, 171, and the parallels there given, as also Āpast., i, 7, 21.8; Nārada, xii, 73 ff.; Vishṇu, xxxiv; Parāçara, x, 9–11; Agnipur., 173.47 ff. Cp. Meyer, Kauṭilya, 263.31 ff. and addit. Violating the teacher's marriage-bed (gurutalpa) and incest are often in other places not kept apart, which is very natural. Among the four great deadly sins the gurutalpa is always found.

[1] A truly priestly addition, at any rate inserted later, but typical. But the "punishment by study" in Vasishṭha, xxvii, 19, Vishṇu, xxx, 4–8, is just as important, and many like things.

[2] Cp. Manu, xi, 177 f. Those spoken of here are not women who for once forget themselves, but those who are utterly vicious (vipradushṭā) and will have no check or bridle put on them.

[3] That is, if she is unfaithful to a husband of higher caste, especially a Brahman (according to the comment. only such a one is meant), and consorts with one of a lower caste.

doer burn" (xii, 165.63 ff.).[1] Cf. also xiii, 111.89 ff.; xii, 165.36.

[1] The law books and the Purāṇas no less angrily brand intercourse with a woman below a man's own caste, and particularly with one above it. The Brahman who lies with a slave-woman goes to hell (Garuḍapurāṇasārod., iv, 37); if he goes to a Pariah woman he becomes a Pariah himself (Baudh., ii, 2, 4.14 = ii, 2.67; Manu, xi, 176); he is the same as the defiler of the teacher's marriage-bed (Yājñav., iii, 231). The man of the three upper castes who lies with a Çūdrā woman must be banished (Āpast., ii, 10, 27.8). The man without honour who demeans himself to an antyā (woman on the lowest rung of the social ladder) must be put to death (Vishṇu, v, 43), or branded and banished; a Çūdra man so doing becomes himself an antya (the antya who goes to an āryā or woman of the three upper castes is, of course, put to death). Yajñav., ii, 294. According to Parāçara, vii, 8 the Brahman who lies one night with a Çūdrā woman must live for three years on alms, and recite mantras daily; while x, 5 ff. lays down for intercourse with a Pariah woman fixed penalties, which also consist of gifts of oxen. It is significant that it is the Çūdra man who suffers most here, and so upwards to the Brahman, who only has to fast for three nights. Manu punishes intercourse with a woman of lower caste by heavy fines (viii, 373; 382–5). Āpastamba, ii, 10, 27.8 punishes with banishment the man of the three upper castes who finds delight with a Çūdrā woman. Naturally the dragging down of a woman is a still worse thing. A Kshattriya, Vaiçya, or Çūdra who lies with a Brahman woman is burnt. This same fate befalls the Çūdra man who sins with a Kshattriyā or a Vaiçyā woman, and the Vaiçya man who sins with a Kshattriyā woman. Vasishṭha, xxi, 1–5. There is at least this much, however, that good grass, but less so as we go down the castes, is used for this fiery cleansing. It is in a fire of straw according to Baudh., ii, 2.52 f. that the Çūdra man suffers death; others must keep chaste for a year (but cp. the commentator). The man's death alone can atone for his intercourse with a woman of a higher caste (Nārada, xii, 70; Yājñav., ii, 286). If a Çūdra has intercourse with an Āryā woman, then his penis is cut off and his property confiscated; if the woman was a ward he is put to death. Gaut., xii, 2 f.; Manu, viii, 374. Āpast., ii, 10, 27.9–10 simply enjoins execution for this case. Heavy punishment also befalls according to Manu, viii, 375, the Kshattriya or the Vaiçya man who defiles a Brahman woman, in certain circumstances even death by fire like the Çūdra man. And so on with other cases. The woman who thus lowers herself comes out of it, according to many

codes of law with very little harm, but according to others very badly. The glance of the woman who has had to do with a man from a caste below her, like the Çūdra man, makes unclean. Āpast., i, 3, 9.11–12. Āpast., ii, 10, 27.10, condemns the woman who commits adultery with a Çūdra man to fasting and mortification only. Vasishṭha, xxi, 1–5 ordains as follows: The Brahman woman who had to do with a Çūdra, a Vaiçya, or a Kshattriya man has her head shaven, her body smeared over with butter, and is led naked along the street on an ass, which is black where the intercourse was with a Çūdra man, yellow for a Vaiçya man, white for a Kshattriya man; thus she is cleansed again. 13 prescribes, according to the caste of the fellow-offender, various mortifications (cp. 20) for the adulteress who lets herself be embraced by a man under her rank. It seems therefore to be a question whether the sinning woman has done more evil or less, as Bühler holds (cp. e.g. Manu, xi, 177, 178). So also Baudh., ii, 3.49 ff. But according to Vas., xxi, 12 a woman of the three higher castes who has received a Çūdra man can be rid of her guilt by making an atonement, only if she has not got with child thereby; and in any case, if she sinks still lower, then she must be cast out (10). If a woman does wrong with a man below her caste, she has to suffer, according to Yājñav., ii, 286, the cutting off of her ears, and suchlike punishment (= Agnipur., 258.69b). Yājñav., iii, 298 declares: The principal offences of a woman leading to loss of caste are: intercourse with the low (nīca), abortion, and murder of her husband. So essentially Gautama, xxi, 9. Parāçara, x, 16–19, as already mentioned, lets her that has been ravished by a Pariah be cleansed by the penance in the well, and rites of purification and mortification, and then by her monthly course. The same punishment as in the MBh. falls on the woman committing the crime of having connection with a man of a lower caste (nihīnavarṇagamana) according also to Gaut., xxiii, 14. According to Manu, viii, 371 f. the haughty (jñāti-strīguṇadarpitā) adulteress and her fellow are to have their reward in the way given in the Epic. For this purpose there are specially trained dogs (Manu, viii, 371; Agnipur., 227.42). So too Bṛihaspati, xxiii, 15, prescribes this death (or mutilation) for the bold woman who herself comes into the man's house, and seduces him; the man thus surprised naturally comes off more lightly. The inveterate adulteress is in general put to death (Vishṇu, v, 18); and Yājñav., ii, 279 f. ordains: A wholly bad woman, such a one as has killed a man or destroyed a dam is to be drowned with stones round her neck, unless she be with child. Of a woman that makes poison, of one that is an incendiary, or of one who slays husband, guru, or child, the ears, nose, lips and hands shall be cut off, and she be put to death by bulls. But

A man shall not even look on a stranger naked woman (xii, 193.17).[1] The evil-doer who looks with sinful eyes on a naked woman is born again as a weakling (xiii, 145.51 ; 162.47) ; and he that looks on his neighbour's wife with impure eyes comes into the world blind at birth for his wickedness (çl. 50). Involuntary shedding of seed must also be atoned for,[2]

husband and wife are reminded not to bring one another before the court of justice (Nārada, xii, 89). It is for the husband in the first place to punish the adulteress. Of this more will be said later. Of course the Epic, the law writings and the Purāṇas threaten the Çūdra especially, who embraces a Brahman woman, with the most awful Saṃsāra punishment; and according to MBh., xii, 165.35, 36 if a man not a Brahman and a Brahman woman have relations with one another, loss of caste follows, as also with agamyāgamana. Cp. Meyer, Kauṭilya, 263.31 ff.

The treatment, given in the text, following xii, 165, of the woman who defiles herself with a man below her rank has particularly roused horror in Professor Hopkins. We may here be reminded of our own forefathers, who were after all very well-inclined to women. "No free maiden could marry a man of the servile class without suffering servitude or capital punishment. . . . The Burgundian law provided that both the free maiden and the slave be slain. . . . Among the Goths, if a free woman married her own servant they were both to be flogged in public and burned at the stake" (Rullkoetter, *The Legal Protection of Woman Among the Ancient Germans*, Chicago, 1900, pp. 58, 59). Among certain South Sea islanders the nobleman marrying a girl from the people was punished by death (Westermarck, 370 f. after Waitz-Gerland). *Noblesse oblige*: the heavy punishment falls on him who is high, for he must show himself worthy of the honour he gets, and avoid any debasing of himself. Among the Old Indians it is never marriage but adultery with such a man that is the object of these threats.

[1] Cp. Vishṇupur., iii, 12.12 ; Mārk.-Pur., xxxiv, 23 ; Manu, iv, 53 ; Vishṇu, lxxi, 26 ; Yājñav., i, 135 ; Gautama, ix, 48. Cp. Meyer, *Altind. Rechtsschr.*, index under "Nacktheit".

[2] Cp. Manu, ii, 181 f. ; Gaut., xxiii, 20 ; Vishṇu, xxviii, 51 (and the parallels in Jolly's transl.) ; Yājñav., iii, 278 ; Baudhāyana, ii, 1.28 (= ii, 1, 1.29). Onanism is also of course punished. Of special importance is this in the case of the brahmacārin (the disciple bound to chastity). According to Vasishṭha, xxiii, 4 this offence must be atoned for in just the same way as the Veda-learner's intercourse with a woman. Cp. Manu, ii, 180. But if the brahmacārin goes

and this according to xii, 34.26, is done by a fire-offering. Seed and the shedding of seed is, indeed, magically dangerous. It also belongs to full chastity, as already mentioned, that a man should not know a woman (prajānāti, i, 64.117) before she has reached puberty (aprāptayauvana). Perhaps the heights of considerate chastity are reached by Nakula, the hero beautiful, "most worthy of gaze in all the world," who goes off into banishment plastered with dust all over his body, as he does not wish to turn the women's heads on the way (ii, 80.6.18).

It is in the light, then, of the passages given on the importance of offspring that the ordinance in xii, 35.27 must be understood, which seems to be at variance with the commandments of chastity: "If a man is begged for it (bhikshite) as for a pious alms, lying with the wife of another does not put a stain on law and virtue." The commentator says: If a man is begged by a woman for the dharma's sake: "Pour in the seed!" And as this half verse stands in a didactic discourse highly tinged with Brahman views, Nīl. is undoubtedly right, and we hardly need have in thought a generous chivalry on the man's, namely the warrior's, side, such as comes into the myth of Çarmishṭhā and Yayāti.[1]

to a woman (avakīrṇin), then according to MBh., xii, 24 he must be clad for six months in an ox-skin and carry out the penance of the Brahman-murderer, and also in xii, 34.1 ff. his name is given along with the slayer of a man of the priestly class and other wicked evil-doers, and prāyaçcitta (atonement) is imposed on him. Cp. v, 38.4. According to the law writings he gets cleansed again by sacrificing in the night at a cross-ways to Nirṛiti (goddess of corruption) a (one-eyed) ass. The sinner must put on the ass's skin with the hair outside, and (with a red begging-bowl) beg at seven houses, making known his deed. (He must eat only once a day, and bathe in the morning, at midday, and in the evening.) Besides this other offerings and atonement rites are also given. Baudhāyana, ii, 1.29–34; iii, 4; iv, 2.10 f.; Āpast., i, 9, 26.8; Vasishṭha, xxiii, 1–3; Manu, xi, 119–124; Yājñav., iii, 280; Vishṇu, xxviii, 48 ff.; Gautama, xxiii, 17–19; xxv, 1–5; Pārask.-Gṛihyas., iii, 12.1 ff.; Agnipur., 169.15b–18a (essentially = Manu, xi, 119 ff.). Any other self-polluter comes off lightly (bathing, Vishṇu, liii, 4, etc.; to say the Gāyatrī a thousand times, and three times to hold the breath [prāṇāyāma] in Parāçara, xii, 63; and so on). Cp. Baudh., iii, 7.1–7; iv, 2.13; Āpast., i, 9, 26.7; Manu, xi, 174; Vishṇu, liii, 4; Gaut., xxv, 7.

[1] Cp. too the words of this king in i, 83.32–34.

VIII

The Continence of Man

NOT only is the refraining from adultery a part of the five-fold dharma (xiii, 141.25), but the Epic, as does Indian literature so often, declares : " Chastity is the highest virtue " (or : the highest law, brahmacaryaṃ paro dharmaḥ, e.g. in i, 170.71). In this passage it is not a question of the purity of the ascetic, but since Arjuna is living a chaste life—the scene belongs to the time when the brothers are going to Draupadī's choosing a husband—he can overcome the Gandharva Aṅgāraparṇa during the night. Now Arjuna, at least later on, is no very great paragon of chastity, for during the twelve years' continence he undertakes he has various erotic adventures (with Citrāṅgadā, i, 215 ; with Subhadrā, i, 219 ff.). The instructive either-or that the snake fairy Ulūpī then forces on his conscience does not give him much difficulty : the love-fired lady puts it before him (as happened to the young hero in Barlaam and Josaphat and to others in East and West) that by rejecting her he will also have her death on his soul ; and he is at once ready to save the fair one's life (i, 214). Bhīshma, on the other hand, who for love of his father, has renounced all the joys of love and family, takes his vow very earnestly, and will not have the slightest thing to do with anything that is woman, that is called woman, or has anything whatever in common with woman. See especially v, 172.16–20, and Nīlakaṇṭha's gloss. By Çiçupāla, who in this is certainly not alone, he is indeed most basely suspected because of his rare virtue (ii, 41.2, 25 ; 42.8).

Naturally in the Epic, too, the ascetic shines in the most glorious of haloes, and great is the worth and the might of his utter renunciation of sex. Bhīshma thus teaches Yudhishṭhira : " He that on earth from birth to death observes chastity, for him there is nothing beyond reach, know this, O herdsman of men. But many tens of millions of Ṛishis live in the world

of Brahma who take their pleasure in the Truth, ever bridle their senses, and keep wholly continent. Continence that is practised burns up all that is evil, especially in the Brahman, for the Brahman is called a fire" (xiii, 75.35 ff.). Divine in the word's deepest meaning is this virtue, but it is not an easy one. Thus in xii, 214.7 ff. we find: "As to that form of Brahman (the divine Absolute and First Cause, the Ātman) called Chastity, it stands higher than any of the virtues (religious ordinances); through it we come into the highest Being, into the Featureless, the Unconnected, which is taken out of the realm of sound and sensation, which, through the ear is hearing, and through the eye seeing, which as speech proceeds from speaking, and which is without manas. Let a man make the firm resolve of (this Brahman, of) spotless chastity, through the channel of the buddhi. He that lives wholly therein reaches the world of Brahman, he of the moderate life therein reaches the gods, and he that is with knowledge, who only gives himself up to the lesser practice of it, is born again as one that stands out among the Brahmans. Hard indeed is chastity. Hear, then, the way from me. The passion that has kindled and risen let the twice-born one keep under. Let him not give ear to speech of women,[1] nor gaze upon them, when they are unclothed. In some way or other through the sight of them passion may take hold of the weak man. If passion arises in him, then let him undergo mortification.[2] If he is in great erotic straits,[3] then let him put himself in water. If he is

[1] This can mean: "women's speech" or "speech about women". The very sound of woman's voice inflames the heart, as Buddhistic tales, especially, show.

[2] Or as the commentator says: the vow of fasting, which consists in his eating only in the morning for three days, then for three days only in the evening, for three days more eating what he has got without asking, and the three last days nothing at all. Cp. Manu, xi, 212, and the parallels therewith.

[3] Mahārti. Cp. in my translation of Kshemendra's Samayamātṛikā, p. 59, note 1; MBh., iii, 46.44; Divyāvadāna (ed. Cowell and Neil), pp. 254, 255 (kleça and roga = hot desire); Dāmodaragupta's Kuṭṭanīmatam in my transl., pp. 59, 131. There vyādhi is anyhow = hot desire. With kaṇḍū in the same passage cp. the Finnish kutku, itching = hot desire.

overwhelmed[1] in sleep, then let him whisper in his soul thrice the prayer that cleanses sin away.[2] Thus will the wise man burn up the evil that is the inward passion, through his ever ready manas[3] bound up with knowledge."

That even the strictest penitents are not proof against woman is shown by innumerable Indian tales, and by a whole set of them in the Epic. As an irresistible power dwells in perfect asceticism, and heaven and earth are no more than clay in the hands of such a holy one, so even the gods in heaven tremble before him, and Indra, who fears to be dethroned by the mighty one, is well known to send at such times one of the unspeakably lovely fays of heaven, one of the hetæra-like Apsarases, down to the dangerous one. If he is really love-proof, he is usually overpowered by such rage that he sends forth his curse and so crashes down from his heights. It is true that the pious Triçiras ("three heads"), whom a whole troop of these courtesans of paradise seek to seduce with every wanton art, keeps an untroubled peace of soul, and Indra has to slay him with the thunder-bolt (v, 9). But what nearly always happens is that the ascetic is fired with lust, and forgets his chastity. Thus it is with the famed Viçvāmitra, who begets Çakuntalā with the Apsaras Menakā. Indra entrusts this heaven-maiden, surpassing all her sisters in loveliness, with the delicate task. But she sets before him the more than divine deeds of this royal Ṛishi, and says that he who by the might of his fire burns all the worlds, brings the earth to quake with his foot, can roll up (or : overturn) Mount Meru and the quarters of the world, —he that before now has made new worlds with new starry systems will destroy her by fire in his rage. Therefore the

[1] By passion. Or, by the shedding of seed, as the comment. takes it. But this second meaning would not harmonize with the passage just quoted, xii, 34.26.

[2] Or that cleanses evil away (aghamarshaṇa). The reference is to Rgv., x, 190.

[3] The manas, the "inner sense", is the channel for the impressions of the perceptual senses, and brings about the action of the active senses; so too it is the seat of the wishes, of desire. The buddhi is the faculty "of distinguishing, of determining, of judgment, and of decision." See Garbe, *Sankhyaphilosophie*, pp. 244–72.

king of the deathless ones must send with her the god of love and the wind to help. This is done; and when the enchanting one stands before the penitent, the wind is wafted thither laden with forest scents, and blows the wanton one's garment away. She bends down hastily after it, smiling shamefacedly. But Viçvāmitra is so carried away by the charms of her bared body that he invites her to love, "and the faultless one wishes for it, too." The two stay together a long age, but it goes by them like one day (i, 71.20 ff.). In the Rāmāyaṇa Menakā happens to bathe near Viçvāmitra, and overborne by love he asks her to lie with him. Ten years go by him, in pleasure and ecstasy with her, like one day and night. Then he comes to himself, and by fresh mortification sets the gods and Ṛishis in dread. Indra now bids the Apsaras Rambhā to undertake the saving work of seduction. As she is fearful of the adventure so fraught with disaster, he goes himself to stand by her, changed into a kokila-bird, and accompanied by the god of love. The staunchness of the holy man is indeed shaken by the bird's sweet, heart-mazing notes, and the incomparable singing and semblance of the nymph, but he sees that it is a snare of Indra's, and falls into such anger that he curses the temptress into stone, and so loses his penitential powers (Rām., i, 63, 64).[1]

Particularly frequent in the Mahābh. are the tales of penitents who at the mere sight of a lovely woman are thrown into an orgasm. Çaradvant, the son of Gotama, not only highly learned in the Veda, but also an eager and skilful bowman, brings torturing pain to the prince of the gods through his asceticism. Indra sends down the heaven-maid Jānapadī to make him human. When the forest-brother sees the very lightly clad and enchanting creature, he stands there with wide-opened eyes, his bow and arrow fall to the ground, and a shudder goes through his body. He makes, indeed, a brave stand, but his excitement drives his seed forth without his noticing it. He leaves his beloved arrow lying there, and flees before the all too dangerous

[1] A free poetical version, fusing the two tales together, is to be found in my collection of poems *Asanka, Sudschata, Tangara und andre Dichtungen*, p. 58 ff. Good, too, is iii, 110.40: Since Ṛishyaçṛiṅga in the forest away from the world never saw a human being (that is, no woman either) besides his father, therefore remained he so chaste.

one. Out of his seed, poured into the cane-brake and split into two, arises a twin pair, Kṛipa and Kṛipī, who are found by King Çāntanu when he is hunting, and then adopted (i, 130.1 ff. ; cp. v, 166.20 f. ; 55.49). The zealous ascetic Bharadvāja sees the young Apsaras Ghṛitācī, who, wrapped only in her blinding naked loveliness, is bathing in the river. His seed that escapes in the love-urge he puts in a pitcher (droṇa), and Droṇa comes into being, the famous teacher of arms to the Pāṇḍavas and other princes (i, 130.33 ff. ; i, 166.1 ff.).[1] ix, 48.64 ff. tells us that Bharadvāja's seed, that came forth because of Ghṛitācī, dropped into a leaf packet and thus gave life to Çrutāvatī. Thus, too, it is Ghṛitācī who in like wise helps Vyāsa to get a son. He is just then busily engaged getting fire with the two rubbing-sticks. The lovely one arouses a violent storm of love in his soul, "which surges through all

[1] In this last-named passage also the wind carries off the lovely one's garment, while in chap. 130 the drunken wanton seems to let it fall herself on the bank. To bathe naked is, indeed, not the Indian custom ; it is even looked on as a dreadful sin (originally because of the danger of spirits). See note 3, p. 203 of my *Hindu Tales* ; MBh., vii, 73.32, 82.9 ; xiii, 20.1 ff. ; 104.51, 67 ; Kuṭṭanīm., 366 ; Parāsk.-Gṛihyas., ii, 7.6 ; Āçva.-Gṛih., iii, 9.6 ; Çāṅkh.-Gṛih., iv, 12.31 ; Gaut., ix, 61 ; Baudh., ii, 3, 6.24 ; Vishṇu, liv, 23 ; lxiv, 5 ; Manu, iv, 45 ; xi, 202 ; Yājñav., iii, 291 ; Mārk.-Pur., xxxiv, 34 ; Agnipur., 155.22 ; Bhāgavatapur., x, 22 (here the shepherdesses are bathing naked, Kṛishṇa carries off their clothes and says in çl. 19 that as they [here indeed as dhṛitavratā] have jumped unclad into the water, they have mocked the gods). Yet even the pious, chaste wife of Cyavana bathes naked (iii, 123.1), and wholly unclothed bathing women are also often found elsewhere, but especially those of the band of heavenly fays, who in this, too, show the way for their sister wantons on earth. See, for instance, further xii, 333.17 f., 28–30, and in my version of Kshemendra's Samayamāṭṛikā, p. xviii. Bathing-clothes (in the house) are called snānaçāṭī in xiii, 20.1 ff. Also sleeping naked is forbidden (e.g. Manu, iv, 75 ; Gaut., ix, 60 ; Vishṇu, lxx, 3 ; of course here, too, the fear of magical harm is the real basis). On the other hand it is well known that people in Germany, even, down to Luther's time slept without any clothing whatever, and even later than that time this custom is widespread. See Stratz, *Die Frauenkleidung*, etc. [3], p. 19 ff. ; Max Bauer, *Das Geschlechtsleben i. d. deutsch. Vergangenheit* [2], p. 40.

his limbs, and overwhelms his understanding." But he holds himself in check, and although his seed falls onto the lower fire-stick, he goes on steadfastly, and so in the end twirls his son Çuka into life (xii, 324.1 ff.). Mankanaka, the forest-dweller living in the unspoiled purity of youth, puts his seed into his water-vessel, when, while he is washing in the Sarasvatī, he sees a glorious woman bathing naked, and his semen thus spurts out into the waves. Seven Ṛishis thus arise, the fathers of the wind gods (ix, 38.32). The same gift came to the Sarasvatī from the holy Dadhīca, when at Indra's bidding the Apsaras Alambushā appeared before him. But the river goddess this time took the seed into her bosom, and bore a son, whom the father later welcomed with joy (ix, 51.5 ff.). Ṛishyaçṛiṅga, whom we shall meet with again, has a like origin. But here it is the bathing Kaçyapa who is stirred by the loveliness of Urvaçī. A she-gazelle drinks up the love-sap along with the water, and bears Ṛishyaçṛiṅga (iii, 110.34).[1] Cp. Windisch, *Buddhas Geburt*, etc., p. 21 ; Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes*, ii, 283 ; iii, 234 f. ; Hartland, *Primit. Patern.*, pp. 12 ; 23 f. ; 151 f. ; Weber's *Ind. Studien*, xiv (1875), p. 121 f. ; also MBh., xiii, 85.17 ff.

[1] The same Urvaçī is seen by Varuṇa, the prince of the waters, playing with her girl-friends, who is fired by her, and seeks to lie with her. She tells him that her love, indeed, is his, but her body is Mitra's. But his fire now is too hot, and with her glad consent he discharges the seed into a pitcher, and in this the fruit is formed (Rām., vii, 56.12 ff.). Varuṇa, it is true, is no saint, and his rape of Utathya's wife will be described later on. Cp. further Hartland, *Prim. Patern.*, i, 12, 23, 151 (fertilization by drinking semen). According to K, i, 150, the king of Pañcāla lived a life of sternest penance in the forest that he might get a son. There one day he saw the Apsaras Menakā in the blooming açoka-forest. His seed fell onto the ground, and filled with shame, he trod on it with his feet. From his seed arose King Drupada, the father of Draupadī. Such tales are found already in Vedic times, as the origin of Agastya and Vasishṭha shows. Cp. Sieg, *Sagenstoffe d. Rigveda*, p. 105 ff.

IX

The Pleasures of Venal Love

AWAY in the forest the penitent buried himself in the deepest mysteries, or lived piously cut off from the world, and strove earnestly, although not always with complete success, after a stainless chastity ; but in the towns and cities the harlot, often very wealthy and of great distinction and quite often very well educated, went in her splendour along the street, taking to herself the fiery eyes and hearts of the men, but above all their purses—India is the land of sharpest contrasts. And in what civilized land has not "venal love" played its part? The Hindu has always sung the praises of "the public woman" as the very type and embodiment of perfect womanhood.[1] In the Epic, too, as already in the Veda, the woman for sale is something that is a matter of course, even though the enraptured song of praise to these earthly lieutenants of the unembodied god of love, as sung especially in the artificial poetry, is here wanting. Ever since those dim days, when, according to the already told legend of the Mahābh. (i, 104.36), Dīrghatamas, saint, and poet of the Veda songs, blind from birth, brought into the world the pleasures of love granted for ringing coin, the horizontal trade had been flourishing in the land of India ; and if the "public woman, open to the visits of all" (nārī prakāçā sarvagamyā) wore a red garment, a red

[1] On her see my three books: Daṇḍin's Daçakumāracaritam, p. 46 ff. and 205 ff., Kshemendra's Samayamātṛikā, and Dāmodaragupta's Kuṭṭanīmatam (all published by Lotosverlag, Leipzig), where, however, I should now like to add much, and in some things to make some changes. See, too, in my Kauṭilya the passages under "Luṣtdirne". There is no need, perhaps, to make mention of R. Schmidt's excellent works: *Vātsyāyanas Kāmasutra, Indische Erotik*, and *Liebe und Ehe in Indien*. In them will be found abundant information on this leading figure in the Indian life of love, or rather lechery.

wreath, and red gold (viii, 94.26), by this garb, recalling the god of death and the public execution,[1] she was not marked out as something criminal or ill-omened, although, of course, her class took a low rank in the social order, but it was far rather that she must be distinguishable for the greater ease and comfort of the world of men, as for instance the charitable sisters of the order of Saint Amor, in the German Middle Ages by their yellow dress so often spoken of.[2]

[1] In a model city, according to Meyer, Kauṭilya, 75.1; Agnip., 106.7, they must dwell also in the southern part, that is, in Yama's quarter of the heavens. On red as the colour of death see the good essay of Fr. v. Duhn, "Rot und Tot", *Arch. f. Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. 9, p. 1 ff.

[2] But the German city-fathers may usually have had quite other ends in view in laying down such marks for them. See, e.g., G. Wustmann, "Frauenhäuser u. freie Frauen i. Mittelalter," *Arch. f. Kulturgesch.*, Bd. 5, p. 469 ff.; Max Bauer, *Die Dirne u. ihr Anhang*, p. 110 ff. Mantegazza (*Geschlechtsverhältnisse d. Menschen*, p. 363, note) reports a catalogue of the sixteenth century which came out in Venice, and offered for everyone's needs the most exact information as to the public women living in this city. Suchlike lists from old and from modern times are to be found in Iwan Bloch, *Die Prostitution*, i, 491. About the red garb of the harlot see Daçakumāracar., p. 51. Red is the most favoured colour on earth (Stratz, *Die Frauenkleidung*[3], p. 74), and also in India the colour of life, passion, love (*Hindu Tales*, p. 106; Tod, *Rajasthan*, i, 612; red at the Holi festival; and so on); it is the most usual colour for women's clothing in the Epic also (e.g. i, 221.19; 212.9; xii, 296.20; xiii, 45.5), and then yellow. Both are very elegant, as yellow was the modish colour, too, in the German Middle Ages. Cp. Billington, *Woman in India*, pp. 76; 181; 183. Then harlots and criminals like keeping up survivals from a rougher culture, as for instance tattooing and a superstitious religiosity among ourselves also (cp. e.g. Maupassant's "Maison Tellier"). As red is so mighty a scarer of demons, it is no doubt on this account that it is to the liking of the always-highly-endangered lightning conductors of public vice. At the love visit by night, it is true, Rambhā in the Rām., and Urvaçī in the MBh. wear dark clothing, but naturally to be less seen. The white garments of the fair one hastening to the tryst is often mentioned in Indian literature, and made use of for poetical feats of skill. Red wreaths are worn too by the hetæræ of heaven when they make their way to the hour of dalliance (Rām., iv, 24.34),

The veçyā or śtrumpets are in the Epic, as elsewhere in Indian literature, an important part of the life of the city. When the great fight is to burśt forth, and the armies are there fully equipped, Yudhishṭhira, the pious one, sends into the royal city, among many other more or less tender greetings, one, too, to these granters of delight: "My dear friend, ask after the welfare of the fair-decked, fair-clad, scented, pleasing,

as they are by the earthly abhisārikā. Although according to xiii, 104.84 no red wreaths are to be worn, but only white ones, yet red flowers may be worn on the head. But kamala and kuvalaya are to be altogether avoided. Vishṇu, lxxi, 11–12 is very śtrong that no red wreaths but water-flowers are to be worn. Cp. Gobhila, Gṛihyas., iii, 5.15. As, indeed, white is in general the lucky colour, and red often the colour of ill-hap, of evil magic, and of death, white wreaths are among the lucky things, red among those foreboding evil. In the main, white flowers are also to be offered to the gods, red ones and black to the spirits (bhūta), and red-flowered plants with prickles serve to bewitch foes. To the Yakshas, Gandharvas, and Nāgas let water-flowers be offered. That Kāma, however, the god of love, was worshipped with red açoka-flowers is shown, for instance, by Gauḍavaho, 754. It is natural that Çiva, the god of the souls of the dead, and of procreation, should wear red wreaths (xii, 284.147). Cp., too, Billington, p. 222 f. Flowers that have grown on a graveyard or in sanćtuaries of the gods muśt not be brought along to the wedding or to the pleasures of love (rahas). See Rām., v, 27; ii, 25.28; MBh., xiii, 98.28 ff.; and cp. also Zachariae, *Zeitschr. d. Ver. f. Volksk.*, Bd. 14, p. 303 f., 397, note 3; Lewy, *Zeitschr. d. Ver. f. Volksk.*, Bd. 3, p. 136 f.; then Dubois-Beauchamp [3], p. 645 (red flowers for the bhūta); ibid., 388 (red flowers offered at magic rites); Thurśton, *Omens and Superśtitions*, etc., pp. 42, 47, 48 (white flowers lucky, red unlucky). Red turbans and red garments are to be worn by the prieśts at the sacrifice that is offered up as magic againśt foes. Baudh., i, 6, 13.9. Cp. ii, 8, 15.5. Here no less belongs the following solemn magical rite: He who in disputes fixes the boundary wears red garb and on his head red wreaths (and earth). Yājñav., ii, 152; Nārada, xi, 10; Bṛihaspati, xix, 11; Manu, viii, 256. Rules as to which flowers are to be offered the gods and the forefathers, and which not are given also in Vishṇusmṛiti, lxvi, 5–9. Cp. Agnipur., ccii, 1 ff. and ccxlviii, as also Mahānirvāṇat., v, 147 ff. In the third passage it is, however, at the same time taught that beśt as offerings are the fifteen *spiritual* flowers.

happy, pleasure-fraught women of the houses of joy (veçaśtriyaḥ), whose glance and speech glide so easily and sweetly along" (v, 30.38). Indeed, the heroes in their camps have no need to feel themselves alone: on both sides, besides other objects of a luxurious life, they have taken with them plenty of these most necessary supplies. When they march out to the battlefield of Kurukshetra, in the midst of the army of the Pāṇḍavas is Yudhishṭhira, as also çakaṭāpaṇaveçaç ca yānayugaṃ ca sarvaçaḥ "carts, traders' goods, and pavilions, and the chariots and draught-animals in a body" (v, 151.57–58; cp. 196.26). These chariots and draught-animals are certainly for the hetæræ also, perhaps for them first of all, for in the Epic the better sort of women, particularly the noblewomen and the Kshattriyas, usually drive in yāna.[1] When the camp has been pitched on the battlefield, these sections take their place in the baggage-train in the rear. The enemy force under Duryodhana is accompanied by craftsmen, professional singers, spies, and gaṇikā (women of pleasure, v, 195.18, 19); and in çloka 12 we are further told expressly: "But Duryodhana had the encampment made like another embellished Hāstinapura." In the Rāmāyaṇa (ii, 36) Daçaratha gives orders for a splendid

[1] Ratha is seldom found here. See iii, 293.19; iv, 22.11. Yāna, so far as I know, does not denote a litter in the MBh.; this is called çibikā or perhaps nṛi-(nara-) yukta yāna, and is used especially for carrying out dead bodies, but also for women. See i, 127.7, 9; xi, 10.1 f.; 16.13; xii, 37.41; xv, 22.20; 23.12; xvi, 7.19; cp. xvi, 7.11 and 33. On the other hand, at least Rām., vi, 114 uses yāna and çibikā as equivalent to one another. Cp. too MBh., iii, 69.21, 23. The ladies' chariot is drawn by horses, the most distinguished or typical beast of the Kshattriyas (cp. also Baudh., ii, 2; 3.4, 9), and by she-mules, sometimes by oxen (the Brahmans' beasts), asses, or camels (xvi, 7.11, 33; iv, 22.11), while according to the law writings the ass and the camel are tabu as draught and saddle beasts (see, for instance, Vishṇu, liv, 23; Manu, xi, 202; Yājñav., i, 151; iii, 291; Jahn, Saurapurāṇa, p. 141); and it is an ill omen also for the man in the Epic, if he in a vision drives with asses (southwards). But see also ix, 35.23. According to the Çiçupālavadha the women ride on asses or horses in the army, or drive in light chariots (v, 7; xii, 20; xii, 14). That in particular the 'circulating beauties' (vāramukhyā) drive along in yāna we learn for instance from Bhāgavatapur., i, 11.20.

army to be fitted out for his son Rāma, and there says (çl. 3) : "Women that live by their beauty, those skilled in words, and rich merchants shall adorn the well drawn up troops of the prince." Even when the Pāṇḍavas with Draupadī and other women, and the burghers that wish to go with them set out in deepeſt grief to make sorrowful visit to their mother, who has withdrawn into the penitential foreſt, and their other kinsfolk there dwelling, Yudhishṭhira gives orders not only that the very splendid royal household shall go with them as a necessary retinue, but also that the "chariots, traders' goods, and brothels" shall also be taken (xv, 22.21). These womenfolk were indeed an indispensable part of any expedition. Therefore the rulers took them with them when they went hunting, or took their diversion in the country, not to speak of the excursions to the pleasure-gardens. Thus Duryodhana goes hunting with his brothers and friends, and to brand the cattle in the herdsmen's ſtations away in the foreſt. It is a splendid setting out for the green depths, which is very excellently described : the wives of the Kshattriyas go with them in thousands, burghers along with their wives, then singers, too, and skilled huntsmen in crowds ; and traders and the girls of joy have their regular place (iii, 239.22 ff.). Princes that find their delight in horses, elephants, and harlots are evidently not an unusual thing (Rām., ii, 100.50). As so often in other literature, the ſtrumpet is not only the camp's ornament, but the ornament too of civic life, that lovely-coloured, scented flower that the city puts in its hair for all to see, when a feſtival or some other joyful event is being celebrated.[1] King Virāṭa

[1] It is mentioned times beyond number that the "city beauties" dance on joyful occasions. So, too, Mārk.-Pur., cxxviii, 9. The very sight of them brings good luck, while, for inſtance, the sight of a pregnant woman foretells evil. Agnipur., 230.4, 11 ; v. Negelein, *Traumschlüssel d. Jagaddeva*, p. 132 f. ; Bloch, *Die Proſtitution*, i, 474–476. Therefore the Vishṇusmṛiti (lxiii, 29) bids the father of a family : When he is on the journey—well known to be an undertaking under the threat of magic—he shall, as on Brahmans, filled water-pitchers, fire, and other things bringing blessings, so also look on harlots. Cp. Thurſton, *Omens and Superſtitions*, etc., pp. 23 ; 46 f. It is no wonder therefore that these women at public feſtivals

has with the Pāṇḍavas' help been victorious in a dreadful battle, and now sends messengers with the bidding: "Go into the city, and make known my victory in the fight. Young girls shall bedeck themselves, and come out of the city to meet me, and all kinds of musical instruments, and the beautifully adorned gaṇikā" (iv, 34.17.18). So, too, as soon as he hears his son's arms have been successful, he has him welcomed in the triumphal procession of youths and sellers of love, and by the young sister of him that is wearing the diadem of fortune, and her girl-friends (iv, 68.24, 26, 29). When Rāma is to be consecrated as the "young king", the priest Vasishṭha directs the city to be given a festal garb and the things set up in it that bring good fortune, the temples of the gods and holy places to be put in order, and all other preparations to be made. Among these is a band of fair-dight daughters of pleasure drawn up within the second wall of the royal palace (Rām., ii, 3.17, 18). And in 14.33 ff. he then sends to tell the king in a long list all the holy and worldly requirements whose fulfilment he has now seen to, and of all the multitudes of musical instruments, and of the well-decked harlots (çl. 39). Rāma, instead of going to be dedicated as prince goes into long exile and to the stern fight with Rāvaṇa; but at length he comes home again victorious, and then his half-brother, filled with holy joy, gives the command: "Pure men shall honour all the divinities and the holy places of the city with scented wreaths and the playing of music. Sūta, well-versed in songs of praise and old legends, as also all panegyrists (vaitālika), all masters of musical instruments, and the gaṇikā in full numbers, the king's wives and ministers, the soldiery and the bands of army women, the Brahmans and the nobles, and the corporations (gaṇa) with the heads of the guilds [1]—all these shall go out to behold the moonlike countenance of Rāma" (Rām., vi, 127.1 ff.). And when King Kuçika, together with his wife, comes back to his capital after a heavy trial of patience laid on him by the Ṛishi Cyavana, he is received by an escort of honour made up

and shows had their own particular seats for the spectacle (gaṇikānāṃ pṛithagmañcāḥ). See Wilson's Vishṇupur., ed. Hall, vol. 5, p. 24 f.; p. 58, note; and cp. my Daçakum., p. 50 ff.

[1] Or: with the guilds at the head?

of the army, the great ones of his kingdom, and the hetæræ (xiii, 53.65, 66). To Janaka of Videha, the pious king who has penetrated into the deepeſt secrets of the world, Çuka is sent by his father, Çuka who came into being from the araṇī [1] and the seed of Vyāsa that fell on it, and who as a wonder-youth ſtands out through deepeſt knowledge, loftieſt purity of heart, and a mighty asceticism, is sent that the prince so filled with the knowledge of salvation may bring him into the holy of holies of that knowledge. The gueſt is welcomed with great honours; the miniſter takes him into the third walled court of the royal abode, and there into a splendid pleasure-grove, escorts him to a seat, and goes off. "To him came running up quite fifty pleasure-girls,[2] splendidly dight, fair-hipped, young and tender, sweet to gaze on, wearing a thin red garment, decked with gleaming gold, well versed in speech and honeyed words, skilled in dance and song, speaking mid smiles, like the Apsarases in loveliness, practised in the service of love, gifted with the knowledge of the heart's ſtirrings, in all things skilful; they offered him water for the feet, and other things, and marked him out for the tokens of higheſt honour. Then did they offer him well-taſting foods belonging to the season of the year. When he had eaten, they showed him in all its details the enchanting pleasure-wood by the women's abode. And playing, laughing, and singing gloriously, thus did the women, wise in their knowledge, wait on the youth of the noble nature. But he that was sprung from the araṇī, he the pure-minded, bare of all doubt, was set only on the work before him, and as one maſter of his senses and overcomer of his anger he took no joy,[3] nor felt anger. These glorious women offered him a heaven-like couch (çayyāsana) worthy of the gods, adorned with

[1] The lower rubbing-ſtick in making fire (naturally often compared to the woman).

[2] Anyhow such as the Old Indian rulers are wont to keep in their harems. Cp. my Daçakum., p. 54; Gauḍavaho, 161–166 (haughty and merry do bathe the hetæræ of King Yaçovarman in the pleasure-tanks of the rulers he has conquered); ZDMG, 60, p. 282 f.; Meghadūta, 35; Karpūramañjarī, 1, 18.6–8; Prasannarāghava, iii, ſtr. 11; Daçarūpa, ed. Hall, p. 141 at top; Çiçupālav., xi, 20.

[3] Or: was not amorously roused (hṛishyate).

precious stones, spread with priceless rugs. But when Çuka had washed his feet, and performed his evening worship, he sat himself down on a bare seat, pondering only on his task." He then spent almost the whole night sunk in his thoughts, and with holy works (xii, 325.33 ff.).

It was better than this youthful penitent, who was assuredly to be put to the test,[1] that the woman's hero Kṛishṇa knew how to appreciate such marks of hospitality as these. When he is sent by the Pāṇḍavas to the Kauravas, if possible to bring peace about, not only did Duryodhana have rest-houses with women and other needful comforts provided for him everywhere on his road thither, but Dhṛitarāshṭra also gives orders: "My sons and grandsons, except Duryodhana, shall all drive to meet Janārdana in splendid chariots, and finely adorned. And the fair harlots shall go on foot, comely-decked, to meet the most high Keçava. And all lovely maidens, too, who wish to go forth from the city to behold Janārdana may go unhindered" (v, 86.15, 16).[2]

[1] So Marco Polo (Yule)[3], ii, p. 366 relates of the Yogis that when a man wished to be received as one of them, they first sent beautiful temple-dancers to him to make trial of his steadfastness (cp. the note there, p. 370). But following the Venetian's description, it seems to be not Brahmans who are in question, but rather Jains.

[2] In like wise Kṛishṇa when he comes back to Dvārakā (Bhāgavatapur., i, 11.20) is, among other things, given a festal welcome by the servants of love, driving in chariots; and the Abbé Dubois, moreover, tells us that "Ordinary politeness requires that when persons of any distinction make formal visits to each other they must be accompanied by a certain number of these courtesans" (p. 585). But on the next page he stresses that in public the Indian prostitutes are far better behaved than their European sisters, and are treated there correspondingly. Taken by itself, the translation could also be: "All the fair maidens from the city who wish to go to see Janārdana must go there naked." But, as already explained, anāvṛita in the MBh. does not seem to mean "unclothed". Furthermore cp. say xv, 22.22. Then, again, such a piece of lewdness would seem to be foreign to the Indian of old, however little squeamish he often is. It is mainly confined to the West, especially to the older history of the Christian lands. There it often happened that the fairest maidens of the town or city, and these the daughters of the patricians, went to meet a distinguished guest in the costume of Eve in paradise, and escorted him in. On the

exhibition of woman's nakedness in the Middle Ages and later, see especially R. Günther, *Weib u. Sittlichkeit*, Berlin, 1898, pp. 141–163; and on the public exposure of the hetæræ in Greece and Rome, and other matters, see the same, p. 134 ff., Ploss-Bartels, i, 336–48.

As is well known, the vast numbers of prostitutes were in the Middle Ages also, and not least in Germany, well cared for by the State, looked on with favour by the townsfolk and the rulers, and the object especially of keen interest from the clergy and monks, and so forth. Cp. addition, 375.27 in my Kauṭilya, and as an explanation of Manu, x, 47, Agnipur., 151.14b: strījīvanaṃ tu, tadrakshā, proktaṃ vaidehakasya ca. A visiting prince was entertained with the free entry into the houses of ill fame; the public women even went to meet such august lords outside the gates as his escort of honour, as was done for King Sigismund at Ulm in 1434. References are to be found in Ploss-Bartels, i, 416 ff.; Günther, *Weib u. Sittlichkeit*, p. 197 ff.; Weinhold, *Die deutschen Frauen i. d. Mittelalter*, ii, 2 ff.; Schultz, *Das höfische Leben zur Zeit d. Minnesinger*, chap. vii; Max Bauer, *Die Dirne u. ihr Anhang*, pp. 94–100. Here we give only one more passage: "Everywhere at public festivities, especially the reception of princes, they (the public women) were represented as a separate class beside the rest of the people organized in corporations. When important persons were passing through, their (the women's) houses were specially ornamented and lighted to receive them; indeed sometimes on such occasions they were clothed at the town's expense. In Zürich it was still the custom in 1516 that the burgomaster, the servants of the court of justice, and the public women should eat together with the foreign envoys who came to the town" (Dr. C. Bücher, *Die Frauenfrage im Mittelalter*, p. 46 f.).

The counterpart to the Old Indian glorification of the gaṇikā is, as is well known, the high esteem in which the hetæræ were held among the Greeks of old; and in the time of the Abbasids also such ladies are said to have held a like position in Baghdad (Schweiger-Lerchenfeld, *Die Frauen d. Orients*, espec. p. 114). They are likewise held in high esteem in Java, in many parts of Africa, and so forth. Günther even delivers himself as follows on p. 82: "Intercourse with the hetæræ raised the man (in Hellas) quite consciously (!) onto a higher level; for it brought out the individual in him who sought out, heedless of the State, that other individual akin to him, who brought him, over and above the sensual, a lofty spiritual pleasure." Such words would have sounded, to the ears of an old Greek, both quite incomprehensible and ridiculous. He looked for the beautiful body, the refinements of love, and entertainment. This the hetæræ offered him. He had, indeed, honour

This being the actual importance and value set on the girls of pleasure, it can easily be also understood that the Epic is filled with zeal against them in its didactic parts. A vigorous saying that is found again and again goes: "As bad as ten slaughter-houses is one oil-miller's wheel,[1] as bad as ten oil-miller's wheels is an inn-sign, as bad as ten inn-signs is a harlot, as bad as ten harlots is a king" (xiii, 125.9). The ruler is then sharply told: "Drinking-halls and strumpets, as also traders and mimes, and gamblers and others like them—all these are to be held in check as harmful to the kingdom. Where they set their feet fast in the kingdom,[2] they are an infliction for honest subjects" (xii, 88.14, 15).[3]

from such unions, but mainly because he could afford himself such a luxury. This had to be dearly bought. The small townsman gave his money, the poor poet or artist the fruits of his talent. Then it was something distinguished to yield fitting homage to this the "eternal woman". Cp. Iwan Bloch, *Die Prostitution*, i, 283 f.; 340 ff.; 354 ff. The same thing is probably true of Old India. Setting aside a few exceptions, there could probably be no question in either place of real "spiritual pleasures", not to speak of all the fine things in Indian poets, and the mystic-Germanic sentimentalism about the union of souls between "kindred individuals". More sensible here is the glowing dithyramb of Robert Hamerling in Socrates' words addressed to Theodata (*Aspasia*, i, p. 234).

[1] Because of destroying living beings. For this reason by a decree of Rana Jey Sing no oil-mill might work during the four rainy months. Tod, *Rajasthan*, i, 586. Cp. Glasenapp, *Der Jainismus*, 69. For when there is much rain there swarm huge numbers of gnats, insects, and all kinds of nuisances in the air. See MBh., iii, 182.4; Fuller, *Studies of Indian Life*, etc., p. 12 f.

[2] Or: become masters of the kingdom.

[3] As is especially to be seen from Indian narrative literature, the harlot and dicing go together. But when Hopkins deduces from MBh., ii, 68.1 that "loose women frequent the gambling halls", he has misunderstood the text. In the same way thieves and other criminals are inseparable from public women, as, for instance, is so often seen from the Daçakumāracaritam. Yājñavalkya, ii, 266, therefore, among the four tokens by which the police can catch a thief gives that of living in a house of ill-fame (açuddha vāsaka); cp. Meyer, Kauṭilya, 335.8–336.14; addit. 336.34. In the Jaina tale Agaladatta, the harlots' abodes are given as the first places where

thieves are to be looked for (*Hindu Tales*, p. 249 f.). A list very like that given there of the places preferred by criminals is found in Manu, ix, 264 ff., and in it, of course, the veça (pleasure-house) has also its place. The same is true of MBh., xii, 140.41–42. Here praveçashu, if it cannot exactly mean brothel (and I do not know of any evidence in support), should anyhow be changed to ca veçeshu. But as the singular panāgāre here is in any case extraordinarily rare, we must in all probability read : panāgāreshu veçeshu. Thus, too, the parallel, in great part like-worded, in i, 140.63–65. Over and above the fact that the list in the MBh. is so like the two former, in Indian literature the wine-house and the women's house are separated from one another only by a very well oiled folding-door. Among the " open thieves or tricksters " (prakāçavañcaka, prakāçalokataskara) is the harlot, together with the gamblers and those who use false measures and weights, who demand bribes, who make attacks with violence, and who live by giving information as to lucky times and ceremonies (Nārada, Pariçishṭa, 2 and 3; Manu, ix, 256 ff.) ; and Bṛihaspati, xxii, 9, says : Gamesters, prostitutes, and other swindlers must be punished. Cp. Wustmann, " Frauenhäuser u. Freie Frauen in Leipzig im Mittelalter," *Zeitschr. f. Kulturgesch.*, v, p. 473. So the tale comes back then again to the ruinousness of inns, harlots, kings, and so on in Manu, iv, 85 also, and, with some changes, in Yājñav., i, 141. From the harlot the Brahman (or the father of a family) must not accept anything, nor eat any of her food. Vasishṭha, xiv, 10; li, 14; Manu, iv, 209 (cp. 85, 86) ; Vishṇu, li, 7 (otherwise fast seven days !) ; Yājñav., i, 161 (cp. 141) ; Agnipur., 168.3–9 (otherwise atonement by mortification). The man of the priestly caste must, of course, never visit her. If a Brahman goes to an hetæra, then he must carry out a heavy mortification so as to be cleansed. Jahn, Saurapurāṇa, p. 140. Intercourse with her is on a level with sodomy (Parāçara, x, 12 ; Mahānirvāṇatantra, xl, 43). The slaying of a woman that belongs to all is even free from punishment according to Gautama, xxii, 27. But the law writings also give them a somewhat more humane consideration. Their ornaments, being the tools of their craft, must not be confiscated, even though the rest of their property be taken from them. Nārada, xviii, 10 f. And this " public cheat " must also act honourably. If she has received her hire from a man, and then refuses, she must pay the double as a fine. Yājñav., ii, 292. According to Agnipur., 227.44b–45a, if she has promised herself to a man, and then goes to another, then she must restore to the injured one double the amount he has put down, and furthermore also pay a fine to the royal treasury. Kauṭilya under certain circumstances even condemns her to an eightfold restitution. See 195.8–14. If a dispute arises between public

women and their lovers, then the head hetæræ and the lovers shall settle it between them. Bṛihaspati (SBE, vol. xxxiii, p. 266). Very instructive information is also to be found in ZDMG (= *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenländ. Gesellsch.*), Bd. 60, p. 282 f.; and especially in Kauṭilya; see index under "Luśtdirne". In it the public "fair lady" comes off far better than in the Dharma writings. As a matter of course, and as is well known, woman and piety go readily hand in hand, and in this even the public kind of both these is no exception. Thus the holy bathing-places (tīrtha) are often known not only as places for all kinds of love-making, but also as places where light women ply their trade; and in the Tantra literature at a Devacakra, one kind of cycle connected with the worship of a god (or Tantric-mystic), the leading part is played, as Çakti or embodiments of the active power of the divinity, by those five well-known kinds of harlots: rājaveçyā (the harlot of rulers), nāgarī (the city harlot), guptaveçyā (the secret harlot, that is, the woman of good family who secretly follows this calling or these joys), devaveçyā (the harlot of the gods, or temple-dancer), and brahmaveçyā, that is, the tīrthagā (the harlot of the bathing-places). See Mahānirvāṇatantra transl. by M. N. Dutt, 1900, p. xxvii f.

End of Volume I